

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02868 8471

PRESENTED
BY
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BOOK SOCIETY
11, ADAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

65501

PRESENTED

BY THE

Church of England
Book Society,

11, ADAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

FOUNDED 1880.

Treasurer.

FRANK A. BEVAN, ESQ.

Secretary.

JOHN SHRIMPTON, ESQ.

C
11.2 F



LIBRARY

Wycliffe College

TORONTO.

Glenn

SHELF No. BS ~~341~~ F58

REGISTER No. 6000

October 1888



שמות הכתבים

OR

SCRIPTURE ONOMATOLOGY :

BEING

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE SEPTUAGINT AND OTHER
VERSIONS, ILLUSTRATED BY PROPER NAMES ;

ALSO

TWO APPENDICES ON ALTERATIONS AND
TRANSCRIBERS' ERRORS,

BY THE

REV. ELIEZER FLECKER, M.A.,

Second Edition.

WITH IMPROVEMENTS.

“In templo Dei offert unusquisque quod potest : alii aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, alii byssum et purpuram et coccum offerunt et hyacinthum ; nobiscum bene agitur, si obtulerimus pelles et caprarum pilos.”—(JEROM, *Prologus Galeatus*.)

LONDON :

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH & CO.,

1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

1883.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

45202158 ✓

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND
JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L.,
ETC.,
LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM,
THIS WORK IS, WITH HIS LORDSHIP'S KIND PERMISSION,
MOST GRATEFULLY DEDICATED,
WITH PROFOUND RESPECT FOR HIS HIGH CHARACTER
AS A SCHOLAR AND ENCOURAGER OF
SACRED LITERATURE,
BY HIS MOST OBLIGED AND MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT,
THE AUTHOR.



P R E F A C E.

THE following treatise is compiled chiefly from notes made during my collation of the Septuagint and Peshito Versions with the original Hebrew.

Long before that collation had reached the end of the Pentateuch, these notes began to show remarkable results concerning both the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint Version; results which seemed to me so interesting and important that I felt induced to continue my researches with regard to them only. The discoveries which I thus made, were to me as nuggets of gold which rejoice the industrious miner. They seemed by degrees to lay open rich treasures in the science of criticism both sacred and secular; revealing methods of solving Textual difficulties, which perhaps, strictly speaking, had not been altogether unknown before; but, though known, had not received from students the attention which they deserve. By the aid of these methods I have been able to explain decisively many variations and discrepancies between the two most ancient Repositories of God's Word, the Hebrew and the LXX., which had hitherto resisted every attempt at solution by other means. May these successes, for which I am deeply

thankful to Almighty God, to some extent also silence objectors to the Holy Scriptures, and encourage believers in the hope of a speedy triumph of the oneness of the Bible.

Meanwhile, reserving the publication of the Notes on the Hebrew Text, as well as those showing the general results of the whole collation for a future occasion; those concerning the LXX. are here given to the public, together with remarks upon other versions. But as most of these notes were obtained from or strongly confirmed by the observation of the rendering and spelling of Proper Names—than which nothing even in a translation can speak more clearly and positively in support of a critic's theories—it was therefore thought advisable to illustrate these theories by instances taken from among those names. This course led to the adoption of an arrangement of the notes and other matters which was considered most suitable to these illustrations; and thereby the work became, almost of its own accord, a Scripture Onomatology. If this publication should so far answer my design as to contribute in any degree to the advancement of sacred criticism, I shall deem my pains well bestowed and amply rewarded.

Perhaps I may also premise that, short as the following dissertations are, yet considering the variety

of questions which they discuss, taking also into account that some of them are either new, or if not new, have only been considered in other connections before, I may ask the indulgence of the reader if he find me unwarily to have committed some mistakes.

I have also to ask the reader's kind forbearance with the imperfections of the Uncial Alphabet on page 66. It was with great difficulty that a few casts were obtained showing the outlines of some letters which among the capitals are now entirely superseded by others with modern forms. For the remaining letters we have had to use ordinary capitals.

And here I avail myself, with much pleasure, of the opportunity of making my best acknowledgments to the friends who last year took so kind an interest in my tract on "Variations of Versions," that, without an advertisement, it was spread to nearly all parts of England.

I have also to thank the Bishop of Durham for his very kind permission to inscribe this work to him. But this is not to be considered as in any way rendering his Lordship responsible for the matter therein contained.

DURHAM *May 4th*, 1883.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
CORRUPTIONS OF AGE	3
ETHNIZATION AND IDIOMATIZATION	6
HELLENIZATION	8
THE ENGLISH BIBLE	10
I.—Suffixes	13
II.—Gentilia	17
III.—Amalgamated Suffixes	19
IV.—Y for י, and β for י	21
V.—M for מ, and β for מ	24
VI.—The Softening β	26
VII.—Vowels for the Letters י, י, ה, נ	28
VIII.—Γ for γ, and the Pronunciation of both	33
IX.—Vowels for ה	37
X.—Hissing Letters	42
XI.—Θ for ת	45
XII.—K for כ, and τ for כ	46
APPENDIX I. :—	
Alterations and Transcribers' Errors	57
APPENDIX II. :—	
“Bosor” — 2 Pet. ii. 15	69

SCRIPTURE ONOMATOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

IN this age of keen criticism, searching deeply into the very foundation of matters of all kinds, it is truly surprising that, of the derivation of Scripture names in their English and Greek forms from those of the original Hebrew, no investigation of any consequence has ever been seriously attempted before. No particle of the language of Holy Writ has been considered exempt from free and inquisitorial examination by friend and by foe; but names only have in this respect received little or no attention at all. It is well-known that nomenclature is of great importance in every branch of literature. Even in fiction names are carefully chosen, and their forms duly weighed and scrutinised. In history it would be utter confusion and ruin to change even one of the principal names. But more, perhaps, than in any other writing is this the case in Scripture. There the original forms are of the greatest value and importance. Every name has a meaning. Some, if not all, were specially chosen, or invented with a view to the meaning which they convey; and if the form of any was altered, it was in order to alter the meaning.

Thus Abram means "high father," but Abraham, "father of a multitude"; Sarai means "princely," but Sarah, "princess." Yet in the translations of Scripture history, as well as in Scripture prophecy, the most complicated variations exist among names of persons and places of every degree of importance; and few only have escaped all variations, so as to be in form exactly like their Hebrew prototypes. For, ever since the LXX. was made, alterations which were first necessitated by unavoidable linguistic rules, were allowed for more than 2,000 years to be multiplied by transcribers, and to be crystallised and perpetuated by secondary Versions made from the Greek.

Since, then, no systematic examination of these variations has ever been made before, a treatise which has this for its object, can require no lengthy Preface or Apology at its Introduction. It is a want which had to be supplied. Indeed, strictly speaking, not one, but two wants are supplied here. For this examination of the names has led to generalizations and explanations which are also, if not altogether new, yet unapplied, and almost unknown even in the best works on Textual Criticism in general or on the LXX. in particular. Here, from the nature of the case, their application is confined almost solely to the variations of names; but, at least, some of them can include, with equal truth, other words of all kinds, which, for want of these applications, have hitherto remained unexplained. Moreover that the subject is also one of great importance, not

only to Bible students by the additional light which it throws on Scripture exegesis and criticism, but also to many others on linguistic, philological, and antiquarian grounds, the following pages will, I believe, indirectly but clearly manifest. In the mere pursuit of their own specific teaching, they will show it even far better than any number of words expressly devoted to its demonstration ever can or will do; therefore, altogether, it can only be wasting time here to launch out into any further remarks upon their importance, or upon any other prefatory matter.

CORRUPTIONS OF AGE.

We say then, at once, that if we enquire how those modern forms of Scripture names have been derived, and why so many of these derivations are so unlike their originals as almost to constitute new names, more or less different from those we read in the Hebrew; we shall find that they are mostly ascribable to two great causes, viz., Hellenization, and natural or accidental corruption. The one has supplied the original variations, whose authors were chiefly the translators; the other came at all ages from the hands of the transcribers.

Take first the corruptions of age. It is especially through this latter cause that the LXX., perhaps more than any other work written in any language, seems to have followed the English rule, that the spelling of names is arbitrary. In English we have Smith, Smyth, Smythe; also four or five spellings for Elliott;

and so for many other names. Some are not even pronounced according to their spelling, as Cholmondeley, Majoribanks, Leicester. Thus also in the LXX., many names have not merely one arbitrary spelling but several. Some have different spellings in different codices; and some, which are alike in the codices, are not so in the different books of the Bible. Even a common name like Naphtali is *Νεφθαλειμ* in Genesis, Exodus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Apocrypha, and New Testament; *Νεφθαλιμ* in 1 Kings; and *Νεφθαλι*, which alone is correct in the consonants according to the Hebrew, in 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, and Psalms. Such differences cannot but indicate to some extent, accidental changes. Moreover, the cases which occur the opposite way hardly indicate anything else than the same rule of irregularities. I shall explain this best by an example. One of the most frequent changes that occur in LXX. names is that of final *ν* into *μ*, and *vice versa*. Thus we find both *Ασρων* and *Ασρωμ* for *הזרן*, Hezron, which never is written with an *m* (*Mem*) in Hebrew. Also *Γεσημ* and *Εδεμ* for *גשן*, Goshen, and *עדן*, Eden. Yet, whereas the name *גרשון*, Gershon, the son of Levi, has the second form *גרשם* Gershom in 1 Chr. in Hebrew, it is never thus changed in the LXX. The reason cannot be that the translators wished to distinguish this name from the other Gershoms, of which there are no less than four in the Bible, by keeping the *n* to this, and reserving the *m* to the others. For, first, this name has in the LXX. another strong distin-

guishing mark. It is, in fact, probably through a misreading of the original by the translators, rendered always Γεδσων (except only Gen. xlv. 11, Γηρσων, and 1 Chr. xxvi. 21, Γηρσωνι *bis*). Secondly, two of the other Gershoms (Judges xviii. 30, Ezra viii. 2), also could not keep their *m* in Greek, but were rendered Γηρσων with ν. These reverse cases then, which are indeed few and far between—remarkable as they are as instances of greater regularity in the translation than in the original—even they, I say, are also sufficiently arbitrary to give cause to suspicion, if not of natural corruption, of clerical emendation.

How these natural corruptions have taken place, we cannot stop to show here, but will do so by examples in the Appendices. We must now proceed to show, as we intimated before, that not all the variations of names in Scripture are corruptions, but that a very large number of them have proceeded from the translators themselves. Though, through the LXX. alone, they date back to two or three centuries before Christ, nay, long before then—as the LXX. was probably made only to supply a long-felt want of Hellenistic Jews, to whom, living in Greek-speaking countries, Greek had become the mother tongue—Hellenized names in some form or other must have been household names among them; yet to the present day a large contingent of these names in Greek, Latin, English, and other languages are still as they were from the beginning. They can also be explained by various rules obtained from the consti-

tutions of and differences between the Hebrew and Greek languages. Even of the names that really have suffered corruption, many of the primary forms were not exactly like the Hebrew, but formations of the same kind. Hence, unless these primary formations are the first to be understood, it will be vain to try to solve the mysteries of the latter great cause of alterations, viz., by transcribers' mistakes.

• ETHNIZATION AND IDIOMATIZATION.

The first thing, then, we have to remember is that nearly every language has two modes of translating names. First, some names they change quite arbitrarily, without any reason from philology or etymology for instance, "Germany," Deutschland (Germ.), L'Allemagne (Fr.); also *Ἰακωβος* in French "Jaques," and in English "James." The Peshito, besides spelling names with or without vowel letters, contrary to the Hebrew, sometimes also changing initial *Jods* into *Nuns*, or final *Mems* into *Nuns*, always gives *איסחק* *Ischak* for *יצחק* *Yitschak* (English Isaac), *אתור* *Athur* for *אשור* *Ashur*, *רקם* *Rekem* for *קדש* *Kadesh*, *מתנין* *Mathneen* for *בשן* *Bashan*, *רוביל* *Rubeel* for *ראובן* *Reuben*, etc. It is worth observing here that Josephus agrees with the Peshito in giving *Πουβηλ* for Reuben. Then, in the LXX., we have *Αιθιοπια* for *כוש* (*Cush*), *Αιγυπτος* for *מצרים* *Mitsraim*, *θαλασσα ερυθρα* for *ים סוף* (literally, "the sea of flags," English "the Red Sea"). Here we do not include the numerous instances in which the LXX. either turns common

words of every part of speech into proper names, or translates names by mistake, as if they were common words; for instance (Deut. i. 1), חֲזֵרוֹת Hazereth it renders *αυλαι*, and דִּי זָהָב Dizahab it makes into *καταχρυσεα*. Yet from the above examples it may be seen that we do include some which, having a meaning taken from accidental circumstances, and signifying some qualities or characteristics of the objects to which the names belong, are not without fitness, at least, to those objects; for instance, *Αιθιοπια* which comes from *Αιθιοψ* “a burned face,” and *Συρος* from *συρισσω* “to whistle.” All these renderings, however, are arbitrary; because they are not derived from the name in the original, nor have any connection with the form of it. Let us call this mode of translation ETHNIZATION of names. In the English New Testament also we have several instances belonging to this; as *Diana* for *Αρτεμις*, *Mercurius* for *Ερμης*, *Jupiter* for *Ζευς*, *Mars-Hill* for *Αρειος Παγος*, *Latin* for *Ρωμαικος*, *Greek* for *Ελλην*, etc.

Secondly, but most names in translations are derived from the original forms, but are altered according to linguistic or idiomatic requirements. This mode of rendering names, which in every language naturally embraces a much larger field than the former, we might call IDIOMATIZATION.

In some cases these two modes seem to run into each other, and it is difficult to decide to which of them the translation of a name belongs. Yet the difference between them will be easily seen by the

following example. The word כנענית (a Canaanitish woman) occurs twice in the Bible. But in Exodus vi. 15, it is rendered in the LXX. Φοινισση, which belongs to the class of Ethnization; in Genesis xlv. 10, it is *Xananitis*, which belongs to that of Idiomaticization. Under both these classes are also found names of feasts, and other ceremonial or religio-technical expressions. Thus under Ethnization we may range ελεημοσυνη for צדקה "righteousness"; also αγχιστευς and αγχιστευω for גאל "a redeemer" and גאל "to redeem" (in the English Bible "avenger" and "kinsman"). Under Idiomaticization we find by far the greater number of these expressions, as Πασχα for פסח Passover, σαββατον for שבת, Σαβωθ for שבאות.

HELLENIZATION.

The latter mode of translation, which in general we call IDIOMATIZATION, assumes different titles for different languages: as Anglicization, Hebraization, Grecization, etc. It may also receive distinctive titles for dialects. Hence for the Alexandrian dialect of the Greek language, in which the LXX. was written, it is called Hellenization. Here, then, we come to one of the richest and most interesting fields of philological research. The linguistic peculiarities of Hebrew and Greek, which we shall show in the following pages to have existed in Septuagint times, will be found to be applicable to formations of different kinds under the above title. They will indeed also reveal facts in

both languages which have been either forgotten or never noticed before by grammarians; yet they will be strongly confirmed, we venture to think, by their explaining satisfactorily not only large numbers of these formations, but even forms of names which are so unlike those we find in the Hebrew in their places, that at first sight they are hardly recognisable as the same. They will show the process or processes by which these great changes have taken place. For some names were changed in Hellenization not by one process only, but underwent two or more either simultaneous or successive processes.

There is indeed another element to consider in connection with this, viz., the condition of the Hebrew MSS. from which the translation was made. Instances of mistaken readings of the Hebrew letters by the translators are plentiful both in the LXX. and in the Peshito. Yet these can generally be easily detected. Moreover mistaken readings can only occur in obscure and little-known names. We may perhaps also grant that some names, which are familiar to us, were strange to the Authors of these Versions; so that of them also mistaken readings are not unlikely to have been perpetuated in the Versions. An instance of this in the Peshito is יוכבד Jochebed, the mother of Moses, written with a ד in the Hebrew, but rendered there Juchobor, as if it had been written with the similar looking letter ב. In the LXX. Γερσων (Gershon), of which we spoke before, is perhaps also such an instance by a similar misreading. But we cannot

think that names like *Γομορρα*, *Νωε*, *Ισαακ*, which in the original are Amorah, Noach, Yitschak, and which are not corruptions by transcribers, had received these forms by reason of their having been unknown names.

It is, perhaps, because our English Bible also gives Hellenized forms, which have been chiefly received from the LXX. first into the Latin, and then into other European languages; and because we are thus familiar with these, but are not so familiar with the original forms as they are in the Hebrew, that we generally do not realise the extent of the changes which Bible names have undergone whilst passing from the Hebrew into the Greek. But some idea may be formed of this by considering the inconsistencies to which these changes have given rise in the "Authorised Version."

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

Why is our much valued Authorised Version, which certainly in its time was the most correct and most scholarly translation ever made of the Bible, so full of inconsistencies in names? Under the following articles we shall have several opportunities of pointing out and explaining various kinds of these inconsistencies. Here I only say in general that the chief cause of them was the want of a uniform following either the Hebrew or the Greek. Sometimes it follows neither; as Amashai for עמַשַׁי, Neh. xi. 13, LXX. *Αμασια*; Zithri for כִּתְרִי, Ex. vi. 22, LXX. *Σεργει*; also Ajalon, Jerusalem, and all renderings with the letter *j*, the

sound of which does not exist in the ancient languages. But to many names it gives forms derived from both languages. To some it gives them both in one Testament; as Joppa and Japho, Reuel and Raguel (Num. x. 29) in the Old; Canaan and Chanaan, Sina and Sinai in the New Testament. But mostly it follows the Hebrew only in the Old, and the Greek in the New Testament and Apocrypha; as Ashdod and Azotus, Joshua and Jesus (Acts vii. 54; Heb. iv. 8), and Naphtali and Nephthalim. For further reference the following two lists are taken from the genealogies of Luke iii. and Matt. i. The order in every line is first the English of the Old Testament and of the Revised Version of the New Testament, then the Hebrew, then the English of the Authorised Version in the New Testament, then the Greek of the Textus Receptus.

(A.)—LUKE iii. 33—37.

37. Mahalaleel, מַחֲלֵלֵאֵל; Maleleel, *Μαλελεηλ*.
Methuselah, מֶתוּשֶׁלַח; Mathusala, *Μαθουσαλα*.
36. Noah, נֹחַ; Noe, *Νωε*.
Shem, שֵׁם; Sem, *Σημ*.
35. Shelah, סָלָח; Sala, *Σαλα*.
Eber, עֵבֶר; Heber, *Εβερ*.
Peleg, פֶּלֶג; Phalec, *Φαλεκ*.
Reu, רֵעוּ; Ragau, *Ραγαν*.
Serug, שְׂרוּג; Saruch, *Σαρουχ*.
34. Nahor, נַחֲוֹר; Nachor, *Ναχωρ*.
Terah, תְּרַח; Thara, *Θαρα*.

33. Judah, יהודה; Juda (Matt., Judas), *Ιουδα* (gen. case).

Perez, Pharez, פרץ; Phares, *Φαρες*.

Hezron, חצרון; Esrom, *Εσρων*.

Arni (O. T., Ram), רם; Aram, *Αραμ*.

(B.)—MATT. i. 3—12.

3. Judah, יהודה; Judas, *Ιουδας*.
 Perez, Pharez, פרץ; Phares, *Φαρες*.
 Zerah, Zarah, זרח; Zara, *Ζαρα*.
 Tamar, תמר; Thamar, *Θαμαρ*.
 Hezron, חצרון; Esrom, *Εσρωμ*.
 Ram, רם; Aram, *Αραμ*.
4. Amminadab, עמינדב; Aminadab, *Αμιναδαβ*.
 Nahshon, נחשון; Naasson, *Ναασσων*.
5. Boaz, בעז; Booz, *Βοοζ*.
 Rahab, רחב; Rachab, *Ραχαβ*.
6. Uriah, Urijah, אוריה; Urias, *Ουριου* (gen. c.).
7. Rehoboam, רחבעם; Roboam, *Ροβοαμ*.
 Abijah, Abia, אביה; Abia, *Αβια*.
8. Jehoshaphat, יהושפט; Josaphat, *Ιωσαφατ*.
9. Uzziah, עזיהו, עזיה, etc.; Ozias, *Οζιας*.
 Jotham, יורתם; Joatham, *Ιωθαμ*.
 Ahaz, אחז; Achaz, *Αχαζ*.
10. Hezekiah, חזקיהו; Ezekias, *Εζεκιας*.
 Manasseh, מנשה; Manasses, *Μανασσες*.
11. Josiah, יאשיהו; Josias, *Ιωσιας*.
 Jechoniah (O. T., Jeconiah), יכניה; Jechonias, *Ιεχωνias*.
12. Shealtiel, שאלתיאל; Salathiel, *Σαλαθιηλ*.
 Zerubbabel, זרubbבל; Zorobabel, *Ζοροβαβελ*.

I.—SUFFIXES.

The simplest kind of Idiomatization of names into Greek is that by the addition of suffixes. But the change which this creates in the names, though it seems small at first sight, is yet one of the largest. These suffixes not only alter the original ring of the words themselves, but also destroy their Hebrew rigidity, and make them declinable for the Greek cases. It is, perhaps, for this reason that the LXX., unlike Josephus and other later writers, leave most names without suffix and indeclinable, and treat some Hebrew suffixes as radicals, reproducing them with Greek letters; as the $\iota\mu$ in $\chi\epsilon\rho\upsilon\beta\iota\mu$, and the ι in the patronymics of *Numbers* xxvi., though in those of *Numbers* iii. the ι is omitted. Even the Greek New Testament seems only to be restrained from a number of suffixes by its following the LXX. in Old Testament names. Thus it retains the LXX. form $\text{I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta$ for the patriarch; though to all persons of the same name who belonged to later times, except Jacob the father of Joseph (Matt. i. 15, 16), it gives $\text{I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta\omicron\varsigma$ with the suffix. In the English translations (as we saw above) these are distinguished by "James," and in the French by "Jaques." There are also a few names in the LXX. which only receive the suffixes of the third declension in their oblique cases, as $\Sigma\iota\delta\omega\nu, -\omicron\varsigma$, $\text{A}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\nu, -\omicron\varsigma$.

(1.) Of the first two declensions we consider first the suffixes $\omicron\varsigma$, α or η , and $\omicron\nu$. In the LXX. they are

rarely attached to names other than those which are called *gentilia*, i.e., names which signify the inhabitants of places, as *Μηδος*, a Median. But of these *gentilia* we shall speak below. Instances of these suffixes with names of persons are *Μαρδοχαιος* for מרדכי Mordecai, *Ζωσαρα* for זרש Zeresch. Instances with other names are *Δαμασκος*, *Γαλιλαια*, *Ιοπηη*, *Ιταβυριον*, and *Σοδομα* (neut. plur.), for דמשק, גליל, יפו, תבור (Tabor), סדום. Some technical words with these suffixes are *Ναξιραιος*, *μαννα*, *σαββατον* for שבת, מן, נזיר.

In New Testament names the English translations generally reproduce these suffixes by *us*, *a*, *e*, and *um*; as Epænetus, Tryphena, Phebe, Iconium for *Επαινετος*, *Τρυφαινα*, *Φοιβη*, *Ικονιον*. Yet there are many exceptions. The Revised Version corrects "Urbanus" for "Urbane," *Ουρβανον* (Rom. xvi. 9); though "Urban" would have been better English. "Aristobul," too, of the Geneva Bible (Rom. xvi. 10), might have passed for Aristobulus, *Αριστοβουλου*. But it is an error, at least misleading, on the part of the Authorised Version to call לוֹד (in Ezek. xxx. 5), Lydia, and the inhabitants of it (in Jer. xlvi. 9), Lydians. For Lydia was in Asia Minor, whilst Lud, as the name ought to be (LXX. Λουδ), must in all probability have been in Africa or Arabia.

(2.) The suffixes *ας* and *ης* (*gen. ou*; or *a* and *η*), are common to all kinds of names; as *Περσης -ου*, a Persian; *γειωρας* (גר Chal. גִּיּוּר) a stranger or sojourner; and *Ιωνας -α*, *Πετεφρης -η*, *Ιορδανης -ου*, for Jonah, Potiphar, Jordan (יונה, פוטיפר, ירדן).

Note.—In the English translations these suffixes were the cause of many mistakes and inconsistencies. In some purely New Testament names, partly to avoid ambiguities, and partly for euphony's sake, the translators were bound to reproduce both these and other suffixes with English letters; although, by so doing, they made them integral parts of the names: *e.g.*, to distinguish between *Στεφανος* and *Στεφανας*, the first is called Stephen, the latter Stephanas; Euphony also forbids to alter Demas, Lysias, Apelles, etc. Nor could we fancy Anna with Tyndale and Cranmer for *Αννας*; or Lysania with the Geneva for *Λυσανιου*. Again, some names which occur only in oblique cases, and with no indication of the gender, are doubtful as to what they were in the nominative case; for instance, Olympas (Rom. xvi. 15), for *Ολυμπαν*, might have been Olympa. Thus the Geneva and the Revised Version give rightly Euodia in Phil. iv. 2 for Euodias (*Ευοδιαν*). On the other hand, the Revised Version corrects Junias in Rom. xvi. 7, for Junia (*Ιουνιαν*); the Geneva gives Julias in Rom. xvi. 15 for Julia (*Ιουλιαν*); and Tyndale and Cranmer give Sintiches, in Phil. iv. 2, for Syntyche (*Συντυχην*). Inadmissible are the renderings (*a*) Herman, Hermen, (*b*) Herman, Mercurius, (*c*) Hermas, Mercurius, respectively given by Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, for Hermas, Hermes (Rom. xvi. 14). It is curious that the Authorised Version in the New Testament made a distinction between names in the genitive case and those it found in other cases; as Juda for the genitive *Ιουδα*, Judas

for other cases. But the great, though conscious, mistake of the Authorised Version was to reproduce these suffixes in the New Testament, even with names which itself gives in the Old Testament without them; for instance, Zacharias, Barachias, and Manasses, which the Revised Version restores to Zachariah, Barachiah, and Manasseh.

(3.) Of the third declension occurs chiefly the termination *ιτις*, genitive *ιτιδος*, both for places and for gentilia feminine: e.g., *Χανανιτις* (Gen. xlv. 10), a Canaanitish woman; and often *Γαλααδιτις*, *Βασανιτις*, *Μωαβιτις*, etc., for Gilead, Bashan, Moab, or a woman of Gilead, Bashan, or Moab. The men in these gentilia were distinguished by the termination *ιτης*, genitive *ιτου*, as *Μωαβιτης*, *Αμμανιτης*, etc.

(4.) One more suffix need only be mentioned, i.e., *ιστι*, which signifies "the language," and is a translation of the Hebrew suffix *ith*: for instance (Neh. xiii. 24), *Ιουδαιιστι* and *Αζωτιστι*, for *יהודית* and *אשדודית* (the Jewish language and the Ashdod language).

Corollary 1.—As in other things so even in suffixes, many names are not uniformly treated in the LXX. They either have sometimes one and sometimes another termination, as *Καρμηλος* and *Καρμηλιον*; or they are sometimes used with and sometimes without any termination at all; for instance, *בשן*, Bashan, has both *Βασαν* and *Βασανιτις*. Therefore it need not surprise that a suffix in an oblique case is sometimes found with names which are generally treated as indeclinables, and used without any termination; for

instance, *Σαλωμωντος* (found only in Prov. i. 1, and xxv. 1). Perhaps *Ζογορα*, for Zoar (Gen. xiii. 10), is an instance of this kind.

Corollary 2.—Since it cannot but happen that many names in the LXX. should occur only in oblique cases and not in the nominative; for instance, Barachiah and Media occur only in the genitive, *Βαραχιου*, *Μηδων*; therefore it will be easily seen that some of them will occur with declined terminations, and appear at first sight, when compared with the Hebrew, to be corruptions. This is perhaps the case with *Εδραιν* for *אדרעי*, Edrei.

II.—GENTILIA.

We have already alluded in the preceding section to this branch of Hellenisation by the use of suffixes as belonging to a particular class of proper names, viz., those which signify the inhabitants of places. Yet a few remarks remain to be made, which are best arranged by themselves under their own title. If the LXX. was only sparing in the use of personal suffixes, it went to the extreme in that of the gentilia. The Hebrew language has also suffixes for this purpose, which are all seen in *מואבי*, feminine *מואבית* or *מואבית*, plural *מואבים*; i.e., a Moabite, Moabites, Moabites. But the Hebrew employs them very scantily. The plural, especially, hardly exists in many names, at least not in the Bible; and instead of it the name of the country is used. The LXX., on the other hand, multiplies them unnecessarily to

a very great extent; and that not so much in the singular number, as more particularly in the plural, where they are scarcest in the Hebrew: *e.g.*, it can make no difference whether you say "the land of Canaan," or "the land of the Canaanites"; yet the Hebrew, in Exod. vi. 4, has כְּנָעַן, "Canaan," and the Septuagint Version, *Χαναναιων*, "of the Canaanites." In fact, sometimes it appears that, except where it was quite inadmissible, the LXX. considered all names of places to be those of nations in the collective singular, and therefore preferred thus rendering them as plurals of gentilia, to merely putting down the name as in the Hebrew. This distinction, which the LXX. thus made, is best seen in the following two examples: "the tabernacles of Edom" (Ps. lxxxiii. 6), is *τα σκηνώματα των Ιδουμαιων*; but "lead me into Edom" (Ps. lx. 9 and cviii. 10), is *οδηγήσει με εως της Ιδουμαιας*. Again, Persia is always *οι Περσαι*, "the Persians," except once, Dan. xi. 2, where in the phrase "three kings in Persia," it is rendered *εν τη Περσιδι*.

Yet sometimes names which have suffixes in the Hebrew are given without them in the Greek. This is chiefly the case with those which the translators considered to be patronymies. In Hebrew, patronymies only occur in the singular, and only with the masculine singular termination of the gentilia for their suffix. These supposed or real patronymies the LXX. either gives with the Hebrew suffix in Greek letters, as *Σηλωνι*, *Εφραθι*, etc., or without any suffix

at all, perhaps only paraphrasing them with the addition of *υιος* or *υιοι του* (Josh. xxii. 1).

Of the gentilia, some terminate in *ος*, *ας*, *ης*, feminine *η*; the most in *ιος*, *ια*; and some in *ιτης*, feminine *ιτις*; which are all declined like adjectives in case, number, and gender. Some occur in different places with different terminations; and some have the addition of *εκ* or *βασιλευς των*, or *τυραννος των*, etc. (Job ii. 11). It is a pity that the English Bible also imitates the LXX. in multiplying such renderings unnecessarily; and often so even in passages where the LXX. follows the Hebrew; for instance, 2 Chron. xxi. 8, 9, 10.

III.—AMALGAMATED SUFFIXES.

The mode of furnishing names with suffixes, considered in the preceding two sections, was that by Appendage only. Names without suffix were supposed to be left entire, and to have the Greek termination added. Names with suffix merely exchange their Hebrew for the Greek ones. Great as is the change thus produced in the name, we come now to another mode, which causes a much greater change, viz., that by Amalgamation of the last root-letters with the suffix.

(1.) There are names in the Old Testament whose last letters, when written in Greek without any addition, look like grammatical suffixes. As the LXX. left most proper names without suffix and indeclinable, so also most of these. Such are *Καδης* for קדש, *Αχιμαας* for אחימעז Achimaaz, *Δαχis* for לכיש

Lachish, etc. Only once (Ezek. xlvii. 19), we find in Codex B. *Καδημ*, which is evidently a transcriber's mistake. Yet there are some with these original suffix-like terminations, which are declined. They are of two kinds. First, names like *Κυρος*, *Ασσουηρος*, and *Αρταξεργης*, which are not really derived from their Hebrew equivalents, כורש and ארשורש, but are either Greek originally, or, being historical names, have been engrafted into the language, before the translation of the LXX. was made. Their *os* and *ης* must change according to the rules of Greek grammar. Secondly, names like *Σαππα*, *Γαζα*, etc., that could only have been derived from the Hebrew. They end with a vowel, especially the *a*, which stands for the Hebrew ה, and this vowel is treated as if it were only a Greek suffix. This is one kind of *Amalgamation*. The radical final *a* is amalgamated with the suffix *a*, and both form together one declinable letter; so that by declension we obtain *Γαζης*, *Ανναν*, etc. Generally, the vowels at the end of most names are partly merged, and lost in the suffix, and partly combined or amalgamated with it. Such is *Ζαχαρίας*, *Ιερεμίας*, etc. (*vide* No. VII. below).

(2.) Another, stronger, but much rarer kind of *Amalgamation* is that in which consonants are merged into the suffix, as *Λεβανος* for לבנון, Lebanon.

Josephus, who is more regular in this respect, and uses the system of suffixes to a much greater extent than the LXX. and New Testament do, merges also many more radical consonants into the suffixes; as

Kais for Cain. (Instances of his other Hellenisations are *Nωεος* and *Αβελος* for Noe and Abel, *Λευις* for Levi, *Μαριαμμη* for Miriam.)

Note 1.—In some examples the final *ς* is neither an affix nor a root letter, but an error for an *E* or *O* ; for instance, Gen. xlv. 9, Cod. B., *Φαλλος* for פֶּלֶחַ, Phallu. (See this explained in the Appendices.) The final *η* also of what appears to be a genitive termination, may be a corruption for an *N*. Such, for instance, may be the case with *Ναυη* for נוֹן, Nun, the father of Joshua, which name, it so happens, occurs only in the genitive case all through the Bible.

Note 2 —Changes of final *ς* into *ν*, and *vice versá*, often indicate corrections by those who thought these letters to be grammatical terminations. This probably accounts for Josh. xi. 1, *Ιαβις*, standing for יַבִּין, Jabin ; and Gen. xxxvi. 41, Cod. A., *Φινες* for פִּינֶן, Pinon. A similar correction seems to be *Xappa*, Ezek. xxvii. 23, for *Xappav*, חָרֶן.

IV.—Υ IS FOUND FOR ב, AND Β FOR ג.

The Latins have already taught us that the Greek *Upsilon* was sometimes pronounced like their *v* [see *Evangelus*, Evander (*ευανδρος*)] ; and that the *Beta* had, as with the modern Greeks (and Russians), and as the Hebrew *Beth* without Dagesh, a similar pronunciation. Though these statements, which make those two letters at once Tautophonia and Amphibolia, are contradicted by grammarians of great authority ; yet both are strongly confirmed in the LXX. The

first is confirmed by names like *Eυαλ*, Gen. x. 28, standing for עובל, "Obal." Also Josh. xix. 30, Cod. B., we have *Paav* for רהב, Rehob. These and similar instances look like errors, or various readings; but they only arose from the peculiar general pronunciation of the *Upsilon*, together with their reading the Hebrew *Beth* without a Dagesh. Compare also the word *Λευι* for לוי, Levi; and *Oυαυ*, in the Book of Lamentations, for the letter *Vav*; and *υιος* in the Greek language itself. Ephraim Syrus, in the Peshito, writes *Ευαγγελιον* (Evangeliun) for *Ευαγγελιον*.

The statement concerning the *Beta* is also clearly confirmed in the LXX. by its representing the Hebrew *Var*, mostly indeed by *υ* or *ου* (see examples above); but sometimes also by *β*. Thus in one verse, 2 Kings xviii. 34, we have both *Σεπφαρουναιμ* for כפרוים, which was probably intended to be read Sepharvaim (or Sepharwaim), and *Αβα* for עוה, Ivah. Another example is Josh. xiii. 18, *Βακεδμωθ* for וקדמת, "and Kedemoth." The ancient Greeks also rendered Servius by *Σερβιος*. Zosimus gives *βαληρε* for *valere*. Herodianus has *Σεβηρος* for Severus. (See G. Martinus ad A. Mekerehum.) Adolphus Mekerehus himself gives several instances of this *v* sound of the *β*, as Valerius *Βαλεριος*, Nervii *Νερβιοι*, etc. Yet he says, "Una hirundo non facit ver; nec privilegia singulorum legem possunt facere communem." It is also said that this pronunciation is a remnant of the well-known Digamma. Beza says, "Idcirco fortasse quod quum Graeci (exceptis Aeolibus) illud διγαμμα

exprimere non possent, interdum ejus loco *b*, interdum (et quidem saepius) *ov* diphthongum scripserunt." Nevertheless, we shall see in the next Article that $\mu\beta$ marked the *b* sound; and β , if not always, yet very often, sounded like *v*. Hence also the uncertainty as to the spelling $\Delta\alpha\beta\iota\delta$ or $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta$, showing that both must have been pronounced alike, even like the Hebrew דוד, David or Dawid.

Corollary 1.—By the help of this rule can be explained mistakes like that of Gen. x. 27, Cod. B. Αιβηλ stands for אוזל , Uzal. The Hebrew ז cannot be mistaken for a ב, nor the Greek ζ for a β. But the ז and ς are often mistaken for one another; *e.g.*, 1 Chron. ii. 46, for גזז (Gazez) Γεζουε, as if it had been גז, Gezve; also Num. xxi. 14, $\text{Zow}\beta$ for וזהב (Authorised Version translates "he did"). Thus, also, they might have read in the former passage (Gen. x. 27), אוזל ; and then, as explained above, represented one ς by β. Again, Gen. xxv. 13, Μασσαμ for מבשם , Mibsam, was probably originally Μανσαμ .

Corollary 2.—Not less important is this rule in helping to decide between some *Keri* and *Chethiv*. In the Hebrew Bible it is well known that there are even now double readings, of which that of the Text is called *Chethiv*, and that of the Margin *Keri*. In these cases an old version like the LXX. is often most valuable and decisive: *e.g.*, Ezra ii. 46, Σελαμι shows that the *Keri* שלמי is right, and the *Chethiv* שמלי an error, which has crept into the Text since LXX. times. But sometimes its decisions are enhanced

when at first sight they are not quite clear, but become so when we know how the Hebrew letters were expressed in Greek ; for instance, in 2 Sam. xx. 25 there is a Chethiv ושיא and a Keri ושוא. The LXX. Σουβα evidently decides for the Keri, representing the second ו by β.

V.—*M* STANDS FOR ב, AND β FOR מ.

We have said before that $\mu\beta$ marked the *b* sound. Of this we have several traces in the LXX. : *Aμβακουμ* for חבקוק, Habakkuk ; *Λεβμνα*, Josh. xii. 15, Cod. A., for לבנה, Libnah. But most remarkable are those instances in which the β was lost, and a μ is standing in its place, looking like an erroneous change. There are indeed dialectic changes in Greek between μ and β : see *τερεβινθος* and *τερεμινθος*, both meaning the same. Gesenius says that ב and מ “are in the mouth of Orientals more closely related than with us, so that Mecca sounds almost like Becca ; for instance, דיבון and דימון, the name of a river ; בריא and מריא, fat ; זמן, Chaldee זבן, time. Similarly in Greek : βλιττω (to take honey) for μελιττω, from μελι.”—Ges. Lex., under ב. Yet seeing that such changes in names, especially in a translation, cannot be made without completely destroying the names, the number of these changes, if any, can only be very small. We must explain, therefore, these alterations in the LXX. to have taken place by two successive smaller changes. First a μ was added to the β by those who pronounced $\mu\beta$ like β ; and then the

β was lost in transcription by those who did not observe this rule of pronunciation. For then, as will be easily seen in the following instances, the β was often useless, and thrown out for euphony's sake.

1 Chron. ii. 42, Cod. A., *Χαλεμ* for כֶּלֶב, Caleb, must have been first *Χαλεμβ* then *Χαλεμ*.

Similarly Exod. vi. 23, Cod. A., *Αμιναδαμ* for עֲמִינָדָב, Aminadab.

Josh. xv. 39, Cod. A., *Μασχαθ* for בִּצְקָת, Bozkath.

Josh. xix. 2, Cod. B., *Σαμαα* for שֶׁבַע, Sheba.

Gen. xlv. 13, Cod. B., *Ασουμ* for יוֹב (more correctly Cod. Sam., and 1 Chron. vii. 1, יֶשׁוּב), Jashub.

Observation.—Yet some of these variations may have come from the translators, through mistaken readings of the original. For the letter *Mem* had with them only one form, namely, that which we use for the final *Mem* only, and was therefore in form nearly like the *Beth*. Indeed this is confirmed by the occasional changes in the reverse way, *i.e.*, the Hebrew *Mem* into β ; for instance:—

Josh. xiii. 16, Cod. A., *Βισωρ* for מִישׁוֹר, Mishor (English, “the plain”).

Josh. xv. 31, Cod. A., *Βεδεβενα* for מַדְמַנָּה, Madmannah.

It would lead me too far out of the way to prove that originally there were no final letters in the Hebrew at all. Yet some proofs to confirm what I have said concerning the *Mem* is necessary.

First, that there was no distinction between final and other *Mems*:

Deut. xxv. 5, for ארמי אבד the LXX. has *Συριαν* *απεβαλεν*, equivalent to ארם יאבד.

Num. xxxiv. 11, for משפח הרבלה the LXX. has *απο* *Σεπφαμαρ Βηλα*, equivalent to משפחה בלה.

Isa. xvi. 1, for מכלע the LXX. has *μη πετρα*, equivalent to אם כלע.

Secondly, that the form of the *Mem* was that which we use as the final, can be easily proved by numberless misreadings, on the part of the translators, of the *Mem* for the similar looking letters, as ב, ה, ח, ס, and *vice versâ*, e.g., Judg. iv. 21, for קדומים *Καδησιμ* (קדוסיב).

VI.—THE SOFTENING β .

The letter β often occurs between μ and ρ in names which in the Hebrew have only מר, and no ב between them; for instance, *Μαμβρη* for ממרא, Mamre. This β can only be explained to be the softening β , which also occurs in *μεσημβρια*.

Hence (Gen. xxv. 2), *Ζομβραν* for זמרן, Zimran.

(Gen. xlv. 13), *Σαμβραν* for שמרן, Shimron.

(Ex. vi. 18, &c.), *Αμβραμ* for עמרם, Amram.

(Num. xxv. 14), *Ζαμβρι* for זמרי, Zimri.

Josephus also has *Ζαμβριας* for Zimri, and *Μαμβρης* or *Μαβρης* for Mamre, etc. Nor is this only a Greek device to facilitate pronunciation. The same is found in English and in other languages, e.g., *Chamber* for *Kammer*, *number* and *slumber* for *numerus* and *Schlummer*.

From this we may derive the following Corollaries:—

(a.) Sometimes we find $\beta\rho$ for מר, as $N\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\delta$ for נמרוד, Nimrod. This is explained by supposing again two successive changes. In the preceding number, whilst showing how, by two successive changes, μ came to stand for a ב, we assumed (what can be borne out by numerous examples) that there were transcribers who, pronouncing $\mu\beta$ as β , were fond of adding μ to a β , where there was none before. Now it is also easily seen that there would be others who would think such a μ superfluous, and would throw it out, or lose it in transcription. Further, the same transcribers, finding $\mu\beta\rho$ together, would forget that the β was only a softening β , and that $\mu\beta$ here was not intended to be pronounced as β . They would, therefore, here also reject the μ , and leave the β . The two changes, therefore, in the above name would be from $N\epsilon\mu\rho\omega\delta$ to $N\epsilon\mu\beta\rho\omega\delta$, and then $N\epsilon\beta\rho\omega\delta$. Other instances of double changes are Jer. xlviii. 34, $N\epsilon\beta\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ for נמרים, Nimrim; Josh. xiii. 27, $Ba\iota\nu\theta a\nu a\beta\rho a$ (probably originally $Ba\iota\eta\theta a \nu a\mu\beta\rho a$) for בית נמרה, Beth-nimrah.

(b.) Since the β occurs also as a softening medium between μ and λ , as in 1 Kings xxii. 8, 9, $I\epsilon\mu\beta\lambda a a$ for ימלא, Imlah; 2 Chron. xviii. 7, 8, $I\epsilon\mu\beta\lambda a$ for ימלא, Imla, as also in the Greek word $\mu\epsilon\mu\beta\lambda\eta\mu a\iota$ (perfect passive of $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$); as in English also *dissemble* from *dissimilis*, *humble* from *humilis*; therefore, when we find $\Sigma\epsilon\beta\lambda a$ for שמלה, Samlah, (1 Chron. i. 47, 48), we may assume that it was originally $\Sigma\epsilon\mu\beta\lambda a$, and that it lost the μ in transcription, as above.

(c.) There are other softening mediums, as the β in $\Lambda\alpha\mu\beta\delta\alpha$, from the Hebrew, *Lamed*, and especially the δ in $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, from $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$, or in English "gender" from *gener*, "tender" from *tener*; but I could find no names in which the letters which accept such media come together, unless they had a vowel between them. In the compounds with "En," as En-rogel, En is translated $\pi\eta\gamma\eta$.

VII.—VOWELS FOR THE LETTERS י ו ה נ.

Other causes, that gave to names the forms more or less different from those in the Hebrew, were that the soft letters, י ו ה נ, had no parallels in the Greek Alphabet, and were only represented by vowels; whilst also the Hebrew system of vowel points, which we have now, was unknown then. These two wants left a wide door open to discrepancies.

For לוי we have $\Lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ and $\Lambda\epsilon\upsilon\iota$.

For אהר, "Ohad" (Exod. vi. 5), we have $\Lambda\omega\delta$.

For אביהור we have (1 Chron. viii. 3) $\Lambda\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta$.

For אהבה, "Ahavah" (Ezra viii. 15, etc.), we have $\epsilon\upsilon\iota$ and $\Lambda\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$.

Especially at the end of words, these letters were often merged into the Greek suffix; as $\omicron\zeta\iota\alpha\varsigma$ for צוֹיָהוּ, Uzziyahu (*English* Uziah).

In vain did Z. Frankel ("Historisch kritische Studien") work out an elaborate plan of correspondence between Hebrew vowels and Greek letters. His favourite theory is that the Alexandrians had Hebrew Bibles with vowel points; and to every historical

proof to the contrary, he replies that the system of points only existed in Alexandria, and not in Palestine. But suppose it be so, how did they express them in the translation? The plan which he gives with a few instances, is based upon the vowel points of our Hebrew Bible, but applies only to a few names in the Greek; so that we may well say to this, "Una hirundo non facit ver." It might, perhaps, be said that later corruptions have altered the vowels, and made them unlike the original; *e.g.*, hardly anything is so numerous as the various readings between *αι* and *ε*, which have caused so much confusion in the Greek Text; as:—

Gen. xxiv. 49, for תגידו, "tell," Cod. B. απαγγελι-
λατε, Cod. A. απαγγελιεται.

Gen. xxi. 17, for תנער, "the lad," Cod. B. παιδιου,
Cod. A. πεδιου.

Num. xix. 16, for השדה, "the field," Cod. B. πεδιου,
Cod. A. παιδιου.

It might then be asked, How without vowel points for their guidance, the translators succeeded in making any names to agree with the Hebrew? The reply is easy. First, chance can do a little in the midst of a great body of names like that of the Bible. Tradition, among the Alexandrian Jews, might do a little more with the nomenclature of their Nomos (תורה, Law), and of the stories of their childhood. But, above all, a large number of the names were not strange to them. They were household names; and, therefore, their pronunciation was not doubtful. These names also ha

an accepted mode of spelling in Greek, which, indeed, accounts both for agreements and for non-agreements with the Hebrew spelling, *e.g.*, $\Sigma\alpha\pi\alpha$, which stands for שרי, Sarai (as distinguished from שרה, $\Sigma\alpha\pi\pi\alpha$, Sarah) is confessedly irregular. To agree with the Hebrew, it should be $\Sigma\alpha\pi\alpha\iota$. Why, then, is it not so? Not because anyone was bold enough, or because anyone cared to take the trouble to alter it; but because the name was a most popular one among the Alexandrian Jews. It also admitted of the two former modes of spelling, but not of the latter. The translators, therefore, shrank from a new form like $\Sigma\alpha\pi\alpha\iota$, even as our Revisers of the New Testament shrunk from omitting "James," and putting Jakob in its place, or from introducing Perets for Perez, Chetsron for Hezron. They, therefore, adopted the plan of putting the less common of the former two, $\Sigma\alpha\pi\alpha$ for שרי, which is also less common in Hebrew; and $\Sigma\alpha\pi\pi\alpha$ for שרה, both being popular in their respective languages.

Was there then no system upon which the translators proceeded in spelling unknown names? I answer, Yes. For, first, the *prima facie* probability is that they would wish to spell names as nearly like the Hebrew as they could. But, chiefly, there are clear evidences that they also had done so. We cannot, indeed, explain everything. Perhaps their system did not extend to every case. Yet we have distinct traces that they followed certain rules. The choice of Greek vowels was determined not by any vowel points in the Hebrew, but partly by their

position in the word, and partly by the letters for which they were substituted. Of this system we can only give a few rules with certainty. Others might be discerned, but cannot be confidently affirmed.

The accent is nearly always upon the last syllable that is not a suffix. The exceptions are not derived from the Hebrew, evidently, because their Hebrew copies had no accents. See the difference in 1 Chron. iii. 12, *Ιωάθαν*, Hebrew Jothām.

In words of two syllables, if the first vowel was short, and had only one consonant after it, it assimilated the vowel of the second, as *Βαλααμ* for בלעם, *Bilam*; *Σοκχωθ* for סכת, Succoth.

If there were two consonants between the vowels, the first vowel had to be an *ε*, yet sometimes an *α* or *ο* are found.

For a *Vav* *ο*, *ου*, or *ω* was substituted, from which also the preceding short syllable received an *ο*.

For *Jod* at the beginning of the word, *ι* with or without another vowel was put; for instance, with another vowel, *Ιακωβ*, *Ιαφεθ*; without one, *Ισραηλ*, *Ισαακ*.

Jod in the middle of a word had *ι* or *ει*, as *Δεινα* for דינה; in the last syllable, it mostly had *ει*, as *Σηειρ* for שעיר, *Δαχis* and *Δαχeis* for לכיש; but sometimes *ι*, as 1 Chron. ii. 55, *Θαργαθιμ και Σαμαθιμ* for תרעתיים שמעתיים, the Tirathites, the Shimeathites.

The *ה* and *ס* at the end of a word, and often also in other positions, were represented by *α*; but *ה* at the beginning of a word was *H*, sometimes with and sometimes without another vowel. When the *H* had

another vowel after it, it became a mere sign of aspiration. This sign was afterwards reduced into the smaller one, yet it left its traces in those words in which it was early changed into another letter; for instance, Num. xxi. 20, Cod. A. for *הַגִּיאַ* (English "the valley") has *Ναπην*, but was evidently *Ηαγην*. The shorter sign also did not always escape corruption. It was sometimes changed into *I*; for the same word in Cod. B. is *Ιαπην*; and 1 Chron. iv. 19, for *הוֹדִיָּה*, Hodiah, Cod. A. has *Ιουδαία*, from *Ηουδαία*, *Ουδαία*.

The Hexapla, in writing the Hebrew text with Greek letters, has simpler rules of substitution, and its vowels are more like those of the Masoretic Codex. Thus *Vav* at the beginning of words is expressed by *ou*, as for *וִיהִי* (Vaihee), *ouei*. It very seldom takes another vowel to it, as Ps. xliii. 19, *ouaθet* for *וַתֵּת* (Vatet). In the middle of the word, and at the end, it is expressed by *ou* or *ω*. *ס* and *ה* may be any vowel; but at the beginning, *ה*, as the article, is expressed by *a*; and *י* by *ι* or *η*, or *ε*.

Now these rules, few as are those which we can discover in the LXX., are yet sufficiently clear and frequent in their application to be valuable witnesses of early readings and spellings in the Hebrew. We have alluded in a former section to the Keri and Chethiv, and the decisions which the LXX. can give between them. We can now confirm this by instances of a different kind, and draw conclusions independent of Keri and Chethiv.

From *Ieovs* (Gen. xxxvi. 14) it is certain that they

had יעיש, as the Keri and as the Syriac and Cod. Sam. have it; not יעיש, as the Kethiv.

From *Χαίλων* (Num. i. 9) we can see they had חילן, like Sam., not חלן, Helon.

From *Μωδαδ* (Num. xi. 26) we can see they had מודד, like Sam., not מידד, Medad.

From *Αιζηλ* (Gen. x. 27, Cod. A.) we can see they had איזל, like Sam., not אוזל, Uzal.

As to readings also, from *Σωγαρ*, Num. i. 8, we might guess they read צוער instead of ציער, Zuar. So clear and decisive are these rules, that even from the form *Μωυσης* for משה, Moses, we can draw an inference. Although one would not like our English Bible to imitate the Vulgate "Moyses," as the French do with their "Moïse"; although we might also concede that "Moyses" need not be a direct rendering from a lost Hebrew reading, but was obtained from the Old Italic, or rather with that Version and with Josephus and the New Testament, from the *Μωυσης* of the LXX.; yet the LXX. alone giving this spelling so persistently in Greek, cannot but show that even this name was different in their Hebrew copies from ours. It was spelt מושה, with a ו, as the Syriac has it; not משה, as we have it. Compare Gen. x. 2, *Ιουαν* for יין; though this seems to be an erroneous contraction of *Ιοουαν*, intended to be read *Iowan*.

VIII.—*T* FOR ע, AND THE PRONUNCIATION OF BOTH.

The letter ע has two sounds. Sometimes it was pronounced as a vowel letter, and sometimes like the

Arabic *Ghain*. This second sound is sometimes described as one like the Northumbrian burr; but the LXX. never represents it by a ρ but by a γ , though even this is probably not the exact counterpart, but the nearest in sound that the Greek language had. This γ generally has a vowel after it, as *Γαζα* for עִזָּה, *Γομωρρα* for עִמֹרָה. But sometimes it has none, and the vowel before it, according to a rule in the preceding section, p. 31, is ϵ ; as *Πεγμα* (Cod. A., *Πεγγμα*) for רַעְמָה, Raamah. In the Hexapla it is seldom γ , perhaps only in names derived from the LXX.

The English Bible also gives the two pronunciations; but, except in the New Testament, it does not always follow its Greek predecessor. Of the two examples above, it agrees in the first by rendering that name Gomorrah in the Old Testament, and Gomorrha in the New Testament; but for the second name, it has Raamah; whilst for *Παγουηλ*, another instance of the *Ghain* pronunciation, the Authorised Version gives generally Reuel, only once (in Num. x. 29) Raguel. Again, for רַעִי, it has in the Old Testament Reu, in the New Testament (Luke iii. 35), Ragau.

Observation.—Although there is no indication in the Hebrew of this second sound, except, perhaps, in the relation which a few words with ע have with others containing throat letters, as עֲנַן and גִּבֵּן, “to cover,” עָרַם and גָּרַם, “to crush,” זֶרַע and זָרַק, “to sprinkle,” etc. (See Gesen. Lex., Letter ע.) Although, further, the modern Jews have entirely lost this sound in

their pronunciation of the Hebrew, yet the author of the Peshito knew it, and also expressed it in some names by the Syriac *Gimmel*; for instance (Gen. xxxvi. 43, and 1 Chron. i. 55), גִּירָם, for עִירָם; (Num. xiii. 13), גְּמִלִיאל for עֲמִיאל; and (Num. xxi. 1), גִּדְרָא for עֵדֶר. These renderings were not copied from the LXX., because the LXX., in all these instances, pronounces the *ע* as a vowel letter. Moreover, the LXX. proof of the *Ghain* pronunciation is especially strong, when the name, in which it occurs, is one that was still in existence at the time of their writing; for instance, Γαζα for עֲזָה, a place which is in existence even now, and called Ghuzzeh.

Whether there was a third pronunciation of this letter with a nasal sound, like that which the Jews give to the name of Jacob, and which seems to be confirmed in the above Πεγγμα of Cod. A., and in Αγγαι, Gen. xii. 8, for הַעִי, “Hai,” is a question which is most likely to be asked; but, for want of sufficient data, will perhaps never be decided with certainty. Against it may be quoted Αγχους for אַחִישׁ Achish, Αγγαιος for the prophet Haggai, and many other names in which γγ, or γκ, or γχ do not stand for an *Ain* but for a supposed double throat letter; so that it is impossible to suppose that these letters came in by error. The cause of them is in an old peculiarity of the Greek language. The same uncertainty, which we saw in the pronunciation of the β and μβ, exists also in that of the γ thus situated. During the great controversy as to the pronunciation of the Greek letters,

two questions concerning the γ were hotly debated by the learned disputants. First, whether before ϵ , ι , etc., it was pronounced like j . Secondly, whether in the position which we are now contemplating, it was pronounced like ν . To the first, as to several other questions of those days, we have nothing to say, because the LXX. gives no clue to them. As to the second question, those who upheld the unchangeableness of the letters, maintained that γ was never pronounced like n . A. Mekerehus speaks of a Psalter at Bruges Cathedral belonging to A.D. 1105, in which the LXX. was written with Latin letters, and there *aggelos* stands for *αγγελος* (Sylloge, p. 22). Beza thinks that *αγγελος*, *αγκυρα*, *Αγχισης*, etc., were originally written *ανγελος*, *ανκυρα*, *Ανχισης*; and that the mistakes arose from the similar forms of the ν and γ . Both Mekerehus, Beza, and others maintain that if the Greeks had changed the pronunciation, they would have changed the letter also. They think it absurd that a ν should first be changed into a γ , and then the γ pronounced like ν . Rather, say they, should the ν remain, and if a γ occurs, it should be changed into ν . On the other hand, Priscianus is quoted as saying that the oldest Romans also wrote *Agchises*, *ageps*, *aggelus* for *Anchises*, *anceps*, *angelus*. Yet I am inclined to accept a middle course. The γ was pronounced like ν , but not always. The name En-gedi is particularly remarkable in this respect. In Josh. xv. 62, and 2 Chron. xx. 2, it has γ for the n , in the four remaining passages in which it

occurs, it has ν . This proves clearly that there was an uncertainty at the time of the LXX. We have also Josh. xix. 21, Cod. A., *Ηνγαυνιμ* for עֵין גִּנִּים; and Josh. xix. 27, *Ενγαυ* for וּבְגִי (Cod. B., *Εκγαυ*). Come we to the time of the ancient Versions, and we find they all rendered *Ναγγαυ* (Luke iii. 25), by Nagge, and are followed in the same by nearly all modern Versions, perhaps only Miles Coverdale's Bible excepted, which gives Nange. (The Revised Version gives Naggai). Yet it is not so with *Κεγχρεια* (Acts xviii. 18; Rom. xvi. 1), or *Ασυγκρατος* (Rom. xvi. 14). All Versions are unanimous in giving the n sound to both; and then it is questionable whether they were right in doing so, since the modern village, which is said to occupy the site of *Κεγχρεια*, is called *Kikries*.

IX.—VOWELS FOR η .

Closely connected with the letters we have just considered, is the letter *Cheth*. All scholars now agree with the Jews in reading it as a guttural only. But in the LXX. it has two sounds, one of which is represented by χ , the other by vowels. As a vowel, it differs little from the ν , both being generally a or ϵ . Both also in the middle of words between two consonants, are mostly represented by aa , or a with another short vowel before it. The accent then, if any, was undoubtedly upon the second vowel, the a ; whilst the first was little stronger than the Hebrew *Shera*. This was, in fact, also the case with the ς and η , when-

ever they were thus represented by two vowels in the middle of a word. But at the end of words, after a consonant ϵ , with another vowel before it, are the most frequent distinctions of ϵ and η . It is needless to expand and embarrass these statements by proofs; the examples occur in great numbers all through the LXX. As regards the final ϵ , it is difficult to say what force it had. I do not think that it was pronounced with the accent, though it is given with it in our copies of the LXX. (which seems to me to show that the system of accents is modern). That ϵ , indeed, is a strange phenomenon altogether. Generally the LXX. is rather deficient even in its representation of the Hebrew vowel letters. We have seen how the suffixes absorbed some: \aleph and η before other vowel letters are mostly left unrepresented. The letters $\iota\eta$, which often occur thus together in Bible names, receive very rarely their full acknowledgment. If they stand at the beginning of the words, as in $\iota\eta\upsilon\delta\alpha$, Judah, or in the middle, as in $\alpha\beta\iota\eta\upsilon\delta$, Abihud, they have $\iota\upsilon$ or $\iota\omega$, as if they were only $\iota\upsilon$, without η . At the end, they have either $\iota\upsilon$ or $\iota\alpha\varsigma$; as $A\beta\delta\iota\upsilon$ for $\epsilon\beta\delta\iota\eta$, Obadiah, and $H\sigma\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$ for $\iota\sigma\epsilon\tau\eta$, Isaiah. Even the name $\iota\eta\upsilon\alpha$, Jehu, is mostly $I\upsilon$. Compare also in Ezra viii. 4, $\alpha\lambda\iota\eta\upsilon\epsilon\iota$, Elihoenai, with $E\lambda\iota\alpha\upsilon\alpha$, or Ezra x. 12, $\iota\eta\iota\alpha\lambda$, Jehiel, with $I\epsilon\eta\lambda$. Yet the above ϵ occurs continually in this particular position as a redundant vowel, and no explanation has been given of it. It evidently belongs to a system of signs for indicating something in the pronunciation of the ϵ

and η , by which, perhaps, they were distinguished from the \aleph and η , a system which probably prevailed not at the end only, but everywhere, though in other places it was obliterated through the work of those who seemed to make it their business to reduce the number of vowels.

The η was sometimes also expressed by *H*, the ancient sign of aspiration, traces of which are found even in the middle of words in those cases in which it was early corrupted into another letter; as Gen. x. 14, *ΧασαλωΝιειμ* for כסלחים, *ΧασαλωΗιειμ*. Whether these renderings were accidental, the η having been mistaken for the η , or regular, and part of the above system, is also difficult now to say. The initial aspirate now is not confined to names beginning in Hebrew with η or η . Some of the most common ones have it without any reason that can be found either in the Hebrew or Greek language; as *Εβερ* for עבר, *Αβρααμ* for אברהם, *Ησαν* for עשו, *Ηλι* for עלי, *Ελίσαιε* for אלישע (Elisha). Most of the names which begin with *Ιερ* have it, as *Ιερεμιας*, *Ιεριχω*, *Ιεροβοαμ*, etc. Again, we saw above (p. 32) that the aspirate which stood for an initial η became sometimes *I*; so it was also with that which stood for a η ; as Num. xxvi. 21, *Ιαμουν* for חמול, Hamul; and so probably also with those which stood neither for η nor for η . Many names with superfluous *Iotas* in the LXX. can only thus be accounted for; for instance, Num. xxvi. 38, *Ιαχιραν* for אחירם, Ahiram, must have been first *Αχιραν*.

Beza maintains that the ה had no other power but that of the aspirate, like the Latin *H*. But in the LXX. we have also *Xαμ* for חם, Ham, *Ναχωρ* for נחור, Nahor, etc. On the other hand, some might think it was only when the LXX. mistook the ה for the similar looking ח, that they stamped the character of the latter upon it. But it is not so, for several reasons. (a.) If it were so, we should have found a similar number of reverse mistakes as there is of this; viz., that the letter ח was read as a guttural, and represented by χ. But in Genesis alone, though we find upwards of forty readings of the one kind, we do not find a single instance of the other. (b.) The name *Ητα* is taken from the Hebrew "*Cheth*," which it represents in Greek. (c.) Josephus also and the New Testament treat this letter in the same way. Josephus gives *Νωεος* for נח, "Noah," and the New Testament has—

Ακελδαμα (Acts i. 19) for the Aramean חקל דם
(Hebrew חלק דם); and

Μεσσίας (John i. 40; iv. 24) for משיח (Mashiach).

Origen, in his Hexapla, gives it only a vowel sound. The כ alone with him is χ, and the ה is a vowel letter; for instance, *αια*, Gen. i. 20, for חיה. He hardly makes any distinction between ה, ח, and ע. They are all soft (lenes) breathings. His vowels are nearly the same as those of the Masorites. (d.) Lastly, another reason for believing that it was not by mistake that the ה was rendered as a vowel letter, is seen in the Arabic language, in which also two

letters, the *Ha* and *Cha*, are often found as its representatives; for instance, *Hafar*, "to dig," and *Chafar*, "to blush," are both חפר in Hebrew.

It is curious that the Vulgate and other Versions often represent the ח by an *h*, and that sometimes also when the LXX. has a χ; as *Ahias* or *Ahiah* for אהיה, LXX. *Aχια*, *Ahab* for אהאב, *Aχaaβ*. Sometimes the Authorised Version does so only in the Old Testament, and not in the New, as *Nahor*, *Ahaz*; and *Nachor* (Luke iii. 34), *Achaz* (Matt. i. 9). As to *Rahab* for רהב, the Greek also is *Paaβ*, and only Matt. i. 5, *Paχαβ*. The fact is, the Authorised Version treats the *Cheth* badly. In the New Testament it generally follows the Greek; and, therefore, there we rightly find some names with *ch*, which in the Old Testament have *h*. In the Old Testament, it follows rules of its own. It reserves the *ch* for the כ, when that letter is not rendered by *c*; and only in two or three names it represents the *Cheth* also by *ch*, as in *Jericho*; in three or four it omits it altogether, as in *Eve*, *Enoch*, etc.; and in the remainder it gives it an *h*, as if it were a ח.

It is a pity that the Revised Version of the New Testament, in its anxiety for uniformity with the Old Testament, should have altered the few names which in the Authorised Version are more correct in the New Testament than in the Old. Far better would it have been if it had left such names as they were; and conforming alterations had been found afterwards in the Revised Old Testament.

X.—HISSING LETTERS.

The letters ש and ש, equally with the ס, could only be represented by Σ in Greek. Hence Συχεμ for שכם, Shechem, Σημ for שם, Shem, etc. Even the צ, which we pronounce like *ts*, they could not render so, because the Greek language does not suffer this combination. See σωμασι for σωματσι dat. plur. of σωμα. Hence we have also Σιν for צן, Zin; Σιων for ציון, Zion. Sometimes, however, the צ is, as in the English Bible, represented by *z*; as Ζογορ (Jer. xlviii. 34) for צער, Zoar. The Hexapla and Josephus treat these letters in the same way. The New Testament also has σαβαχθανι for the Aramean שבקתני (Shebaktani); ωσαννα for הושענה (Hoshaanah); Gethsemane for גת שמן (Gath-Shemen); Sabaoth for צבאות; Σαδδουκαιοι for צדקים (Tsadeekim).

It is a pity that the Greek is so poor in the sibilant letters, in which the Semitic languages are so rich. Even the ζ, ξ, and ψ do not belong to their original sixteen letters, which (as testified by Pliny, Dionysius and Plutarch) were brought by Cadmus from Phœnicia, but to the eight double letters introduced later. It is, perhaps, for this reason that ארם, which means Highland, and ארמי, Highlander, are called Συρια and Συρος, which seem to come from συρισσω, "to hiss" or "whistle." (See also above, under Ethnization.) Although, perhaps, if the translators had had in their language all the letters corresponding to the Hebrew Alphabet, they would still not always have

written strictly phonographically, according to the original, as, in fact, they did not seem to do in cases in which they could have done it; yet, to some extent, they might have helped to determine the oft vexed question as to the pronunciation of those sibilants in the Hebrew. One pitiful attempt is made in the LXX. to distinguish these letters from one another. In the book of Lamentations we find the words *τσαδε*, *ρηχς*, *χσεν*; and these, at least, tell us that the *צ* and *שׁ* were not pronounced as *s*, as usually rendered in the LXX., but as we pronounce them. Perhaps the original rendering of the *שׁ* was sometimes *ΣΗ*, but the traces of it are few and indistinct. Yet see *ΑΣΗδωθ* for *אשדוד* Ashdod.

Then how was the *Zain* pronounced? Is it the same as the *Ζητα*? In Lamentations it is indeed called *Ζαιν*. It is also mostly represented by *z* in other parts; yet sometimes it is also represented by *s*, as *Ελιφας* for *אליפז*; *εν Χασβι*, Gen. xxxviii. 5, for *בכוזי*, “at Chezib”; also Num. xxv. 15, *Χασβι* for *כוזי*, Cozbi. In some names in several parts of the LXX. it figures as *σδ*, for instance, *Εσδρας* for Ezra; *Εσδρι* (1 Chron. xxvii. 26) for *עזרי*, Ezri; *Εσδριηλ* (Neh. xi. 13, Cod. B.), for *עזראל*, Azareel. It is also represented by *ζδ* in *Ιεζδραελ* (Josh. xv. 56, Cod. A.), for *יעזראל*, Jezreel. Yet the Arabic language often replaces it by the letter *Dzal*.

Further, what is or what was the Greek *ζ*? For in this, too, grammarians are divided between very much the same different pronunciations, *i.e.*, between

$\delta\varsigma$, $\sigma\delta$, or ζ simple like the English z . That it was not originally a single letter like the English z is seen from its being one of the eight double letters, viz., $H=E\Theta$, $\Omega=O\Theta$, $\Xi=K\Sigma$, $\Psi=\Pi\Sigma$, $\Phi=\Pi H$, $X=KH$, $\Theta=TH$ (the older H being only a note of aspiration). But yet another composition, which has not been mentioned, has, to my mind, a great probability of having been the original, viz. *ts*. For, first the name of the letter is derived from the Hebrew *Tsade*, in the LXX. *Tσαδε*, from which also the German z (*Tsed*) seems to have derived its sound. But chiefly because this is best seen by adding the fourth column to the table of the *αντιστοιχα*, in which grammarians exhibit the *tenues*, *mediæ*, and *aspiratæ*.

π	β	ϕ	ψ	$=$	$\pi\varsigma$
κ	γ	χ	ξ	$=$	$\kappa\varsigma$
τ	δ	θ	ζ	$=$	$\tau\varsigma$

Yet it is evident that the letter did not retain long its original sound; for *Αθηναζε* stands for *Αθηνασδε*, and generally *Αζωτος* for *אשדוד*, *Ashdod*, which, according to the LXX. way of rendering, should have been *Ασδωτ* or *Ασδωθ*, and which is even now called *Esdud*. That sound was altered by the process which Max Müller calls the corruption or decay of language.

It is a pity also that the translators of King James made the indefensible rules for themselves, first to render ז and צ by z ; except sometimes צִיּוֹן, by *Sion* (generally *Zion*), and once, Psalm lxviii. 14, *Salmon* for צַלְמוֹן (in two other places *Zalmon*); secondly, to render a great many שׁ, as well as שׂ, and ס by s .

Once an exception occurs, כְּתִירִי, Ex. vi. 22, is rendered Zithri; but this is altogether a blunder. Two names, זִכְרִי, Zichri, of v. 21, and כְּתִירִי, of v. 22, are confused, and both made into Zithri. Lastly, in these letters, too, they followed the Greek in the New Testament and not in the Old; whereby it happens that we have double forms for the same names, as Pharez, Hezron, Shechem, Shem, Sheth, Nahshon, etc., in the Old Testament, and Phares, Esrom, Sychem, Sem, Seth, Naasson in the N. T.

XI.—Θ FOR ת.

The Hebrew ת, without Dagesh, is rightly expressed in Greek by θ, and not by σ, as is done by the Jews in our days. The Æolo-Doric dialect changes indeed sometimes θ into σ, as σίος for θεός; but this was not the common pronunciation of the θ. We have, therefore, very correctly, in the LXX., Ιαφῆθ for יֶפֶת, Βαθουηλ for בְּרוּאֵל, etc.; and in the New Testament, Mark v. 41, ταλιθα for the Aramean טְלִיחָא. But the ancient Hellenists put θ also in many cases for a ת, in which we have a Dagesh. They wrote Θαρσις for תַּרְשִׁישׁ, Tarshish, Εσθηρ for אֶסְתֵּר, Ester (*English* "Esther"); and in the New Testament σαβαχθάνι is even more remarkable, because, through the aspirate of the θ, a κ also had to be changed into χ; and שְׁבַקְתָּנִי, *Shabaktani* is rendered as if it had been שְׁבַכְתָּנִי, completely changing the letter ק into כ. In fact, only few ת with Dagesh are represented by τ.

The curious fact that this brings to light is that they knew no rule concerning the Dagesh; and probably had no Dagesh existing at all in those days, as they had no points or accents either. Indeed, this absence of Dagesh is seen in all those letters ת פ כ ב, to which two pronunciations are given. They knew the two sounds of those letters, but gave them promiscuously, regardless of any rule that we can discover, e.g., יוסף, Joseph, in the LXX. *Ιωσηφ*, in Josephus *Ιωσηπος*; זלפחד, Zelophehad, in Josh. xvii. 2, is in Cod. B. *Σαλπααδ*, in Cod. A. *Σαλφααδ*. Only one thing is certain, they had a great preference for the aspirates. Origen, in the Hexapla, renders nearly all the ת פ כ by χ φ θ. He takes ק for κ, ט for τ; but, through the want of an alternate letter for the פ, he nearly deprives the Hebrew of the *p* sound. Though the ב, on the contrary, is by Hellenistic writers seldom rendered otherwise than β or μβ; this is only another proof by analogy that the Greek β also was very often pronounced like *v*.

Here again the English Bible, following the Greek in the New Testament only, gives some names in two forms; as Terah, Tamar, Shealtiel in the Old Testament for תרח, תמר, שאלתיאל, and Thara, Thamar, Salathiel in the New Testament.

XII.—K FOR כ, AND T FOR ת.

The remaining two "literæ duplices," כ and ת, which with us have only one sound, have not only two with them, but these sounds are also given according to a

certain rule ; viz., the usual blunt or soft sounds of γ and δ at the beginning and middle of words, but the sharp or hard sounds of τ and κ at the end. This rule was perhaps never formulated by them, yet generally understood and acted upon, as the Germans and others do even now in the case of their *g* and *d*. In consequence of this practice in the pronunciation, either the translators, or some transcribers after them, thought it also a matter of indifference whether they spelt names at the end with either the one set or the other. Thus we have, on the one hand, $\Delta\omega\eta\kappa$ always for דוג, Doeg ; Deut. ii. 13, 14, $Z\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau$ for דר ; and זקלג, Ziklag, is sometimes $\Sigma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa$ and sometimes $\Sigma\iota\kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\gamma$. On the other hand we have Num. xxvi. 30, Cod. B., $X\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma$ for חלק, Helek ; Gen. x. 6, 14, $\Phi\omicron\upsilon\delta$ for פוט, Phut ; Josh. xiii. 18, Cod. B., $M\alpha\iota\phi\alpha\alpha\delta$ for מפעת, Mephaath. Indeed it seems that the confusion of these letters at the end of words extended also to their respective aspiratæ χ and θ . Hence we have $\Sigma\epsilon\rho\upsilon\chi$ for שרוג, Serug ; Josh. xv. 27, $B\alpha\iota\theta\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\theta$ for בית פלט, Bethpalet ; but Josh. xxi. 31, $X\epsilon\lambda\chi\alpha\tau$ for חלקת, Helkath, and in the New Testament $E\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\tau$ for $E\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\theta$, which should really be $E\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\epsilon$ for אלישבע, Elisheba (Ex. vi. 23). This I feel justified in affirming, because, in the Septuagint, every שב, Sheba, whether by itself or in composition, as in Beer-sheba, Bathsheba and Jehosheba is rendered $\Sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\epsilon$. Even the *Ghain* was subject to the same change, as seen in $A\rho\beta\omicron\kappa$ (Gen. xxxii. 2) for ארבע, Arba ; $B\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa$ (Gen. xiv. 2) for בלע, Bela ; $P\omicron\beta\omicron\kappa$ (Num. xxxi. 18)

for רבע, Reba. An exceptional alteration at the beginning of the word is Γαφθοριεῖμ (Gen. x. 14) for כפּתּוּרִים, Caphtorim.

Observation 1.—This partly explains another series of phenomena in the LXX., viz., κχ, πφ, and τθ, a mixture of tenues with aspiratæ as double letters. It is evident they were not double tenues but double aspiratæ. The reasons are these: (a) Because double aspirates hardly ever occur in Cod. B. Αθθαβωρ, Josh. xix. 34, is evidently a corruption for אֲזֹנוֹת הַבּוֹר, Aznoth-tabor; Cod. A., Αζανωθ-Θαβωρ. Also Βαιθθαμε, Josh. xix. 38, Cod. B., is another corruption for בֵּית-עַנָּת, Beth-anath. (b) Because by the above rule we can explain why the first letters were written as tenues, viz., because they were the closing letters of the first syllables in the words. (c) In the Classics there are two, and only two, instances of reduplication of aspirates, and in them also the first letters are changed to tenues, viz., σκχος for οχος, Pind. Ol. vi. 24; σκυπφος for σκυφος, Hesiod (see Dr. Jelf's Greek Grammar, § 36, 3, d.). (d) Perhaps the best proof is obtained by considering that if the name Γεθ for גַּת, Gath, ends with the aspirate θ, the inhabitants of it are called Γετθαιοι; if, on the other hand, Χετ for חֶת, Heth, ends with τ, the inhabitants of this place are called Χετταιοι.

In the New Testament also occurs (Acts v. 1) Σαπφειρη, Sapphira; (Philem. 2) Απφια, Apphia; and several names with τθ, as Ματθαῖος, Matthew. The word Εφφαθα (Mark vii. 34) is undoubtedly

a corruption of *Eθφαθα* for the Aramaic word
 אֶתְפַּתָּח.

Observation 2.—Here we ought to add the letter ב. Yet in doing so we must not think of its *b* pronunciation, according to which we might by analogy expect to see it in the shape of a Greek π at the end of some names. Neither in Hebrew can a ב occur at the end of names except without Dagesh, and therefore with a *v* pronunciation; nor in Greek (see Nos. V. and XI.) will the β thus by itself often have any other sound but that of *v*, or of the Æolic Digamma, the form of which is left in the Roman *F*. With this pronunciation then before us we ought to expect, in confirmation of the above rule, to find it figure as a φ at the end of names. Indeed thus it will not only confirm this rule, but notably and strongly also the dogma enunciated and defended in Nos. V. and XI., viz., that of its *v* pronunciation; and this is the case in Gen. xlv. 13, Cod. A., where *Iασουφ* stands for יִיב, or rather, according to the Samaritan Pentateuch and 1 Chron. vii. 1, for יִשׁוּב. But yet a stronger proof than finding φ for ב is to find β for פ; and this also is the case in 1 Chron. iv. 16, Cod. B, where *Zιβ* stands for זִיפָּה, Ziph.

We have alluded to Gen. xlv. 13. We saw the rendering *Iασουφ* of Cod. A. for the corrupt Hebrew reading, יִיב. This name is further remarkable by the reading *Ασουμ* of Cod. B. Compare now the two readings, *Iασουφ* and *Ασουμ*. If it is true that they both came from one reading, *Iασουβ*, which corres-

ponds to ישוב; and if by one transcriber the name was altered in Cod. A., by the above rule, to *Ιασουφ*; and by another, in Cod. B., it lost the *I* through the preceding *και* (a frequent occurrence, which will be explained in the first Appendix), and receiving *μ* and then losing the *β*, according to section No. V., it became *Ασουμ*; how it confirms all these rules, as well as the reading ישוב of the Samaritan Pentateuch and 1 Chron. vii. 1.

The English Bible, we find, has, in these cases again, two forms for the same names. It has in the Old Testament Serug and Peleg for שרׁוג and פלג; and in the New Testament, following the Greek, it has Saruch and Phalec (Luke iii. 35). But in the Old Testament also, 1 Kings vi. 1, 37, for זר (Ziv) it has *Zif*, even with an exceptional *f* instead of the usual *ph*. Moreover, there is another change, still less necessary, which the Authorised Version makes, that of the Greek *κ* into *c* in the New Testament, as Balac, Cis, Core, etc., for Balak, Kish, Korah in the Old Testament. A. Mekerchus sums up a dissertation upon the *κ*, saying, “Certum est igitur *κ* eodem fuisse sono quaecunque littera sequente, et *Κικερων* pronuntiandum esse Kikeroon.” (Silloge, p. 79.) Erasmus goes further, and says, “It is probable that as in Greek so in Latin, *c* was of the same sound, whatever be the following vowel. (De recta Latini Graecaeque, p. 125.) It is strange, therefore, that when (according to their own principle of spelling names in the New Testament exactly according to

the Greek) the translators rendered *Naryai* Nagge, they should have put a *c* and not a *k* for any Greek Kappa.

And now, as this is the last inconsistency of the Authorised Version that I had to consider, I cannot forbear taking the opportunity of reverting to the Revised Version of the New Testament, and saying that, however various the opinions are about its alterations and emendations in general; of the proper names (except in the small matter of the *ch*, which I pointed out above under No. IX., and a few other trifling matters), all must agree that its corrections are judicious, unobjectionable, and good. Moreover, should it ever be superseded by another revision, it is to be hoped that the nomenclature will not be altered back to what it is in the Authorised Version. Indeed, I may venture to predict that we have not yet arrived at the final fixed, and unalterable forms which Scripture names should have in an English Bible; nor shall we do so till we get the *Cheth* everywhere distinguished from the *Hey*, and all the hissing letters and the soft vowel letters far more individualised than they are now, the accents marked according to the Hebrew, uniformity introduced into both Testaments, Raguel and such exceptional forms abolished, and a spelling adopted which shall be as close to the Hebrew in Old Testament names and to the Greek in purely New Testament names, as the diversities of the characters of the languages will permit. The alterations, therefore, of

the names in the Revised Version are a great advance in the right direction. It is a great improvement to have Kish restored in the New Testament for Cis, and Beor for Bosor, Reu for Ragau, etc. But the Latin proverb is perhaps well adhered to, "Festina lente."

In conclusion, two questions are likely to be asked in two different directions.

(1.) Some will ask whether the preceding explanations cover fully, and reach all the changes which are found in Proper names of the LXX. and of the English Bible? If not, how are the cases that are not affected by them to be accounted for?

(2.) Others will say, Of what use are all these researches, theories, and labours, when they only concern the forms and shapes of proper names, which, after all, may be changed in many ways without affecting the Text?

(1.) To the first question we say, No; the preceding rules are not sufficient by themselves either to clear up every variation, or fully to explain those cases to which they partly do apply. They only contemplate names with single changes of Hellenisation, made by the translators. To the single changes may be added multiple changes, which many of the most familiar names of the Bible have undergone. Such are *Μωυσης*, *Ιουδας*, *Ισαϊας*, *Ιησους*, which, according to the Hebrew, are Moshe, Yehudah, Yeshayah, Yehoshua. These can all be explained by one or more of

the above rules, according to the number of changes that are combined in them. But, although these rules can thus clear up a great number of altered names, they yet leave many untouched, and explain others but partially. For, in addition to all the changes to which they refer, there are many others, that were occasioned by a variety of other causes. First, there were errors or different readings in their Hebrew copies, of which we have very few traces now in ours. It is not my purpose to enter here upon this subject. What can be said upon it, has been said in nearly every good book on Textual Criticism, though sometimes far more has been ascribed to this cause than is due to it. Other causes of variations in names are the dialectic changes of letters, the explanations of which also do not belong to an essay like this, but rather to Greek grammars. Then came the transcribers' alterations and errors, which are the subject of the following Appendix. Above all, a great number of changed unfamiliar names can only be explained as compound changes, being created either by a combination of different kinds of causes, or by a succession of two or more transcribers' errors. A few examples of these we give at the end of the List in the Appendix. Let us take one here: כְּדֹרְלַעֲמֹר, Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv. 1, etc.) is rendered in the LXX. Χοδολλογομορ. Here there was first a Various Reading, or a misreading in the Hebrew. The כ was read as a ד, Chedodlaomer. Then, by one of the above rules, reading the *Ain* as a *Ghain*, another

change was introduced. It became *ΧεδοΔλογομορ*. Lastly, the Δ is easily changed into an Α; and this curiously happened to that Δ which came in by mistake for the ς; so that name finally appears as *Χεδολλογομορ*.

(2.) As to the second question, of what use a work like this is concerning Proper Names only, we reply, in the first place, suppose it be so, that nothing but names are here explained. Is it nothing to clear up confusion in this direction? Is it of no interest to explain how the translators of the Authorised Version came to put "Raguel" (Num. x. 29) for Reuel (see No. VIII.); or Jesus (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8) for Joshua (*Hebrew* Yehoshua); and many other anomalies, of which we could only point out a few as examples, leaving the reader to explain for himself others to which the same rules apply? But we contend, in the next place, that names are not the exclusive objects of this treatise. We have, indeed, so far, confined ourselves to them only. The problems also which we have hitherto set ourselves to solve, referred chiefly to them. Yet let the reader look to the first Appendix, especially to the part relating to transcribers' mistakes. The causes of them are there exposed, I trust, clearly to the understanding of all who can read the Greek letters. But, though there too we say little of any other clerical errors but those in the names; yet will not every one agree that those instances illustrate far more than names only; and that, if none of the former explanations, at least

those there given are important, not only to names, but also to all other words that have suffered similar corruption? This way of solving questions concerning various readings is perhaps indeed not a new one; yet it has hitherto received but little attention, and has never been sufficiently applied. Hardly any one has made the Uncial letters sufficiently answerable for the numberless errors which they have caused.

Why then, it will perhaps now be asked, do we apply this mode of solution chiefly to names, and that only in an Appendix, when, by reason of its wider bearing, it should be the principal part of the work? We answer that we apply it chiefly to names, because no other set of words could speak so strikingly and so positively to the confirmation of it than they. These names were not translations of their originals with strange words of another language, but reproductions letter for letter in Greek. We have the originals; therefore, if we only know how the letters in the two languages were corresponding to each other, then we know what many of the names ought to be in Greek. But we also relegate this portion to the Appendix, because, in many instances, those reproductions were not made to correspond strictly literally from the beginning. The rules of reading were not the same in both languages. Some of the differences were also fluctuating between more than one rule. There were also the rules which, in the Hellenisation of names, operated in other ways than

the mere spelling. All these though interfering with a literal correspondence, created no errors but necessary variations. Hence, before any errors can be deciphered, it is necessary to know these rules, and to distinguish the regular variations which they produced, from the later irregular work of transcribers. Therefore these rules are given first, and then what remains to be said upon the latter, is, I believe, sufficiently explained in the Appendix.

APPENDIX I.

ALTERATIONS AND TRANSCRIBERS' ERRORS.

The explanations given in the preceding pages refer to a system of alterations which were made in names during (and only partly also after) their translation from the Hebrew—even alterations which were necessary or suitable to the nature and constitution of the Greek language. This Appendix contains (*A.*) a few further remarks upon the work of the *Διασκευασται* (*i.e.*, early critical labourers in the Greek text), and (*B.*) a description, illustrated by examples, of some of the principal errors of transcribers which were caused by the ancient mode of writing.

(*A.*) The occupation of the *Diaskeuastai* may be said to have had three departments, the Text, the Words, and the Letters, in each of which they made omissions, additions (or interpolations), and changes, with the objects of either local improvement or general agreement.

(1.) The Text. Their work in this department lay among phrases, sentences, and sometimes large sections of the Bible (as in the book of Jeremiah, and in the last few chapters of Exodus); but had little or nothing to do with names. The consideration of this part, therefore, does not come within the confines of this treatise.

(2.) The Words. Here the intended object of their meddling was generally that of improving the style, without altering the Text, but often also that of effecting either agreements with the Hebrew or verbal agreements among parallel passages; for instance, in Genesis ii. they seem to have omitted, in several cases, the word *Κυριος* before *ὁ Θεός*, because they thought the phrase to be too often repeated in that chapter. For similar reasons they often added or omitted proper names, or interchanged them with the personal pronoun. Again in 1 Chron. xxvii. 33, there must have been *ὁ Αρχι φιλος* for *הארכי רע*, "the Archite was companion." There is now *ὁ πρωτος φιλος*. This change is undoubtedly the work of a tamperer, who thought *αρχι* to come from the Greek word, meaning *original* or *chief*. Thus it is, indeed, now with the same name in the parallel passage, 2 Sam. xvi. 16. *Αρχι* is there: but, instead of its being written as a name, it is a prefix; and the phrase is rendered *αρχιεταιρος*. Moreover, in a similar phrase of 2 Sam. xv. 37, where the Hebrew has *רע* only, the Alexandrian Codex, in order to make it agree with the preceding passage, renders it by the same expression, *αρχιεταιρος*.

Now in this and the preceding departments the only distinct proofs of any variations coming from the hands of the Diaskeuastai, and not from the translators, are the various renderings which occur in the different Codices, and the double readings, now called *conflate*, which are often found in one and the same

Codex. The following two instances of conflate readings among names will suffice as proofs here :

- 1 Chron. xxvi. 7, *καὶ Σαβαχία καὶ Ἰσβακούμ* for *וְסַמְכִיָּהוּ*, “and Semachiah”; Cod. A. has *καὶ σαμαχίας καὶ ιεβακούβ*;
 2 Chron. xxxv. 9, *καὶ Χωνενίας καὶ Βαβαίας* for *וְכַנְנִיָּהוּ*, “Conaniah also.”

In the last example, *Babaías* probably belongs to the earlier translator, who mistook the כ for a ב; *Χωνενίας* to a later worker, who wished to correct the mistake; and the combination of the two to a third one, who probably found one of the renderings in the margin.

(3.) The Letters. This department is the most important for our purpose, because in it the clearest traces and indications of the doings of the Diaskeuastai are discoverable. Their alterations here are, indeed, often of a character to elude the severest test of the critical analyst; here also alone even the Hebrew sometimes fails us in giving a clue to their work; yet, even in their most approved undertakings, often producing a most thorough and complete reformation in certain items of spelling, numerous vestiges of the ancient spelling remain, through previous corruptions of the words. We have mentioned before (Nos. VII. and IX.), that the *H*, as a sign of breathing, was shortened into that mark which is now used for the purpose (‘), and that traces of the *H* remain in certain words which have suffered corruption. The same was the case with the *κς*, when they were changed for the *ξ*. An instance of the ancient spelling remains through a mistake in Num. xxxiii. 24, where *εκ*

Σαρσαφαρ is evidently a corruption of *εκς Αρσαφαρ*, which stands for *מֶהַר שַׁפָּר*.

It is evident that these remnants of the ancient mode of spelling have a peculiar value with regard to the Septuagint, or to the parts of it in which they are found. They cannot but bear testimony to the great antiquity of the version, as well as to the extreme literalness with which it was originally made. But they also remind us of the English Bible, which has also preserved, through oversight, some traces of a former mode of English spelling; for instance, in Num. xxvi. 44, "Jesui" and "Jesuites" for *יִשְׁרִי*, *Jishri*, are relics of the time when *u* and *v* were written alike. In one place "ye" stands for "the," as a witness that in former years this was the usual form of writing the definite article.

Again in the LXX. some dabbler seems to have made it his business to add suffixes to names which had none before; and these additions, too, we can detect in some cases in which they were not admissible except after the corruption of the name; for instance, in 1 Chron. xxvii. 30, *Αβιας* stands for *אֲבִיָּל*. This must have been originally *Αβιλ* or *Αυβιλ*, to which no *s* without another vowel could be affixed. But it got corrupted into *Αβια*; and then an *s* was added, and the name became *Αβιας*. Also in 2 Chron. xi. 18, *Αβιγαταν* stands for *אֲבִיגַיִל*. This must have been *ΑβιΗαιλ*, then *Αβιγαia*, which always stands for *אֲבִיגַיִל*, Abigail; then, with the suffix in the accusative case, *Αβιγαταν*. (See also 1 Sam. xxv.

39, 40; 2 Sam. iii. 3; iv. 25). Further, vowels were often interchanged, as *ai* and *e*, probably because both were pronounced alike. Instances of this were given in No. VII. Here we give a few more instances of this interchange occurring in names :

Ελαμ for אֵילָם, Ailam, which should be Αἰλαμ.

Ελων for אֵלֹן, Elon, which should be Αἰλων.

On the other hand, we find in

2 Sam. iii. 5, Αἰγαλ for אֵגְלָה, Eglah, instead of Εγλα.

2 Sam. xxiii. 25, Σαιμα for שַׁמָּה, Shammah, instead of Σεμα.

(B.) We come, then, now to the transcribers' mistakes. Many mistakes are made by transcribers, for which there is no cause or reason in the exemplar. There is no need to waste time in describing them. We only give a few instances of Transposition of Letters in the first List of examples. But most mistakes found in the LXX., as probably in all ancient works, are due to the peculiar mode of writing of those times. The ancient MSS. were written with Uncial Letters, in continuous lines, without stop or accent. The junction of words, without any mark of division between them, has, in many cases, been the cause of addition of letters to some words, and of omission from others. One instance will here suffice. For וַנִּיהַ, Vaniah, Ezra x. 36, Cod. B., has *Ououania*. The first *ou* is undoubtedly taken from the preceding verse, and represents the last ו of כֶּלְוָהוּ, "Chelluh." Sometimes also letters at the beginning or end of words were doubled, and the addition thus obtained was added to the neighbouring word. Or, if of two successive words

the first ended with the same letter with which the second began, the letter was written only once between them, and so caused an omission in one of the two. All this is sufficiently illustrated in the second and third Lists of examples. But the most remarkable variations that are found in the MSS. are those which have originated in the similar shapes of several letters in the Uncial Alphabet. Through these resemblances, errors in writing and spelling sprang up, not only at the extremities, but also in the middle of words; whereby the words assumed the appearances of others totally different from them, and often changed the whole meaning of sentences also. A few instances of these errors in words that are not names, gathered from Tischendorff's "Vetus Testamentum Græce," 1880, will here suffice.

Lev. xiv. 42, Cod. A., στερους for אחרות, "other," should be as Cod. B., ετερους.

Lev. xxii. 11, Cod. A., εργον for לחם, "bread," should be as Cod. B., αρον.

Lev. xxv. 27, Cod. A., επι for שני, "years," should be as Cod. B., ετι.

Dr. Frankel (Historisch Kritische, § 18) is mistaken when he asserts that at the end of names finishing with vowels, certain letters were added, and sometimes letters were omitted. Except the additions of Greek suffixes, as explained above, nothing was added or omitted systematically. Transcribers might, by mistake, here and there have done the one or the other. But most of the examples that he gives, can be explained by changes of letters. It is evident then that these changes are of great importance, and should be

well studied and sought out. I believe that many difficult passages in the LXX. and New Testament will only be cleared up by discoveries of such errors; and that sometimes these errors, when discovered, will prove to have been the sole cause of obscurities, which, till then, had eluded every attempt at solution by other means. Therefore, to show the manner and varieties in which they occur, we give fourthly an Uncial Alphabet, followed, fifthly, by a copious List of examples in names, in which both the errors and the corrections are exhibited, by means of these Uncial letters, in the following way. Though, in the MSS. the Uncials, not being what we call Capitals, were used for the whole of every word, and distinguished nothing, because no other letters were used beside them; in our examples, in order to show the precise nature and place of an error intended to be illustrated, these characters are used both in the original Greek word and in the alteration only on the exact spot on which the error occurs. In the original words they are used for those letters that are supposed to have been lost in the change, whether they were at the beginning, or middle, or end of the word; and in the alterations, they are put for those that came in by mistake. The remaining letters, that are supposed to have continued unchanged, and are the same in both words, are given in the usual form of cursive letters, with Capitals at the beginning. Uncials are also put in a marginal column, in alphabetical order; and the examples, singly or in sets, are

arranged in the same order; but so that the letters which marked the correction in the original word (not the error) should correspond to those in the margin. Examples, with two consecutive letters, both changed in combination or otherwise, form sets by themselves, and, together with their marginal letters, are given only once. Some sets I could have made much larger than they are; but I confined myself to a few examples in each. These were carefully chosen, with a view to exhibit in the fewest lines the greatest variety of changes that could occur under the same letters. Yet, even so, this List is not as complete as I myself wished it to be. I plead want of time, in the midst of ministerial labours, in excuse for defects. But I also hope that, such as it is, it will sufficiently answer the purpose of furnishing a clear general view of the way in which errors have taken place by mistakes of Letters.

The internal arrangement of the examples is this: The reference is put first. If the error occurs only in one Codex, that Codex is signified in the next place. Then follows the name in Hebrew and English, then the error in Greek, and then the name as it should be in the same language.

Lastly, to complete the subject, I give, sixthly, a few examples, to show how consecutive changes (not counting Hellenisation as one) are supposed to have taken place; and how the present forms of some names are the final results of several errors following each other.

I.—TRANSPOSITION OF LETTERS.

- Gen. x. 3, and 1 Chron. i. 6, **Θοργαμα** for **תגרמה**, Togarmah, **Θογαρμα**.
 Gen. x. 7, Cod. A., **Σαβακαθα** for **סבתכא**, Sabtechah, **Σαβαθακα**.
 Num. xxvi. $\frac{3}{2}$, **Ταναχ** for **תתח**, Tahan, **Ταχαν**.
 Deut. iii. 9, **Σανιωρ** for **סריו**, Sirion, **Σαριων**.
 Ezra ii. 55, **Φαδουρα** for **פרודא**, Peruda, **Φαρουδα**.
 Ezra x. 33, Cod. B., **Ζαδαβ** for **זבד**, Zabad, **Ζαβαδ**.
 Esther ix. 9, Cod. B., **Ζαβουθαιον** for **ויתא**, Vajezatha, **Βουζαθαιον**.

II.—OMISSION OF LETTERS.

- Gen. xlvi. 10, Cod. B., **και Αχειν** for **ויכין**, “and Jachin,” an **I** merged into the **και**.
 Gen. xlvi. 14, Cod. A., **και Αλοηλ** for **ויחלאל**, “and Jahleel,” an **I** merged into the **και**.
 Deut. iii. 10, **εως Ελχα** for **עד סלכה**, “unto Salehah,” an **Σ** merged into the **εως**.
 Neh. x. $\frac{2}{2}$, Cod. B., **υιος Αραια** for **שריה**, Seraiah, the **Σ** made into **υιος**.
 1 Chron. vii. 3, Cod. B., **υιοι Εζραια** for **בני יזרחיה**, “sons of Izrahiah,” **I** merged into **υιοι**.

III.—ADDITION OF LETTERS.

- Gen. xlvi. 12, **και Ιεμουηλ** for **ויחמול**, “and Hamul,” **I** of **και** repeated.
 Num. i. 10, Cod. A., **υιος Σεμιουδ** for **בן עמיהוד**, “son of Ammihud,” **Σ** of **υιος** repeated.
 Num. xxi. 24, **οτι Ιαζηρ** for **כי עז**, “for strong was,” was probably **οτι Αζ ην**.
 Num. xxxiii. 24, Cod. A., **εκ Σαρσαφαρ** for **מחר שפר**, “from Mount Shapher,” was no doubt originally **ΕΚΣ Αρσαφαρ**.
 Josh. xv. 3, Cod. B., **εις Σαραδα** for **אדרה**, “to Adar,” **Σ** of **εις** repeated.
 Josh. xxi. 32, Cod. B., **την Νεμμαθ** for **את חמות**, Hammoth, **N** of **την** repeated.
 Josh. xix. 27, Cod. A., **Ενγαι** for **בני**, “to the valley,” **εν Γαι** joined.
 Josh. xix. 29, Cod. B., **Απολεβ** for **מחבל**, “from the coast,” **απ’Οβελ** joined, and the last three letters transposed.

- 1 Chron. vi. $\frac{11}{16}$, **Καινααθ** for **נחנח**, "and Nahath," **και** **Νααθ** joined.
 1 Kings xxii. 26, Cod. B., **προς Σεμηρ** for **מִן שֵׁן**, "unto Amon," **Σ**
 of **προς** repeated (compare 2 Chron. xviii. 25).

IV.—THE UNCIAL ALPHABET.

A, B or Β, Γ, Δ, Ε or Ε, Θ, Ζ, Η, Ι, Κ, Λ, Μ, Ν, Ξ, Ο, Π,
Ρ or Ρ, C or Ε, Τ, Υ, Φ, Χ, Ψ, Ω.

V.—CHANGE OF LETTERS.

- A** Gen. xlv. 9, Cod. A., for **נלל**, Phallu, **ΦαλλουΔ, ΦαλλουΑ.**
 Always (12 times) for **נלל**, Abihu, **ΑβιουΔ, ΑβιουΑ** (compare Abihud, 1 Chron. viii. 3).
 Ezra ii. 61, Cod. B., for **חבאיה**, Habaiah, **Λαβεια, Ααβεια.**
- ΑΑ** Gen. x. 14, for **מלחם**, Casluhim, **ΧασΜωνιειμ, ΧασΑΔωνιειμ.**
 Lev. x. 4, for **מישאל**, Mishaël, **ΜισαΔΑη, ΜισαΑΔη.**
 Josh. xv. 28, Cod. A., for **חצר שועל**, Hazar-shual, **ΑσαρσονΔΑ, ΑσαρσουΑΑ.**
- B** Gen. xiv. 2, for **שנאב**, Shinab, **ΣεννααΡ, ΣεννααΒ.**
- Γ** Gen. xxii. 24, for **גחם**, Gaham, **Τααμ, Γααμ.**
 1 Chron. i. 40, Cod. B., for **עבל**, Ebal, **Ταιβηλ, Γαιβηλ.**
 Num. xxxiv. 28, Cod. B., for **עמיהוד**, Ammihud, **Ιαμιουδ, Γαμιουδ.**
 Num. xiii. 7, Cod. B., for **גלגל**, Igal, **ΙΔααλ, ΙΓααλ.**
 1 Chron. viii. 36, Cod. B., for **עלמח**, Alemeth, **Γαλαιμαθ, Γαλεμαθ**
 (as Cod. A.).
- ΓΙ** Num. xxi. 20, Cod. A., for **הגל**, "the valley," **ΝαΠην, ΗαΓΙην.**
 Num. xxi. 20, Cod. B., for **הגל**, "the valley," **ΙαΝην, ΗαΓΙην.**
- Δ** 1 Chron. vi. $\frac{22}{24}$, Cod. B., for **עבדי**, Abdi, **ΑΒΑι, ΑΒΔι.**
 1 Chron. vii. 37, Cod. B., for **חוד**, Hod, **ΩΑ, ΩΔ.**
 Gen. xiv. 1, etc., for **מלך עמר**, Chedorlaomer, **ΧοδοΔλογομορ, ΧοδοΔλογομορ** (mistaking **ר** for **ד**).
- ΔΑ** Gen. xiv. 2, for **ברע**, Bera, **ΒαΔΔα, ΒαΔΑα** (mistaking **ר** for **ד**).
- Ε** Gen. xlv. 9, Cod. B., for **נלל**, Phallu, **ΦαλλοC, ΦαλλοΕ.**
 1 Chron. i. 38, Cod. A., for **עיר**, Seir, **ΣηΘιρ, ΣτΕιρ.**
 1 Chron. iii. 18, Cod. B., for **חשמה**, Hoshama, **ΩσαμαΘ, ΩσαμαΕ,**
- ΕΘ** Always (12 times) for **חשמה**, Ish-bosheth, **ΙΕβοσΘΕ, ΙCβοσΕΘ.**

- Z** Gen. xxii. 21, Cod. A., for זען, Huz, ΩΞ, ΩΖ.
 Gen. xxii. 21, for בז, Buz, ΒαυΞ, ΒαυΖ.
 1 Chron. viii. 18, Cod. B., for זליאָה, Jezliah, ΙεΞλιας, ΙεΖλιας.
- H** Gen. x. 14, for כסלחִים, Casluhim, ΧασΜωνιειμ, ΧασΑΔωΗιειμ.
 Gen. xxxvi. 32, for דינהבָה, Dinhabah, ΔενΝαβα, ΔενΗαβα.
 Num. xxvi. $\frac{2}{7}$, Cod. B., for חמול, Hamul, ΙαμουΝ, ΗαμουΑ.
- Θ** Gen. x. 11, Cod. A., for רהבֹת, Rehoboth, ΡωβωC, ΡωβωΘ.
 Josh. xv. 42, Cod. A., for עֵתֶר, Ether, ΑΦερ, ΑΘερ.
 1 Chron. i. 6, Cod. A., for רִיפַת, Riphath, ΡιφαΕ, ΡιφαΘ.
 1 Chron. vii. 31, Cod. A., for בִּרְזִיִּת, Birzavith, ΒερζαιΕ, ΒερζαιΘ
 (Authorised Version follows Chethiv).
- IA** Ezra x. 21, Cod. B., for מַעֲשִׂיָה, Maaseiah, ΜασαΗΑ, ΜασαΙΑ.
- IT** Gen. x. 4, Cod. B., for כִּתִּים, Kittim, ΚΗτιοι, ΚΙΤτιοι.
- Λ** Gen. x. 19, for לִשָּׁע, Lasha, Δασα, Λασα.
 Gen. xxxvi. 36, Cod. B., for שַׁמְלָה, Samlah, ΣαμαΔα, ΣαμαΛα.
 1 Chron. i. 47, Cod. A., for שַׁמְלָה, Samlah, ΣαμΑα, ΣαμΛα.
 Neh. iii. 25, Cod. B., for פַּלַּל, Palal, ΦαλαΧ, ΦαλαΛ.
- ΛΛ** 1 Chron. iv. 17, Cod. B., for יָלוֹן, Jalon, ΙαΜων, ΙαΛΛων.
- ΛΕ** 1 Chron. i. 32, Cod. A., for לִאמִים — ΑCωμειν, ΛΕωμειν.
- M** Num. xxxiv. 20, for שְׁמוּאֵל, Shemuel, ΣαΑΔαμηνλ, ΣαΜμηνλ.
- MA** Josh. xvii. 9, Cod. B., for עָרֵים הָאֵלֶּה, “these cities,” ΙαριΗΑ
 τερεμινθος, ΙαριΜΑ τερεμινθος (reading עִירֵימָה אֵלֶּה).
- MI** Neh. vii. 7, Cod. B., for רַעְמִיָּה, Raamiah, ΡεεΑΜα, ΡεεΜΙΑ.
- N** Josh. xiii. 17, Cod. A., for דִּיבּוֹן, Dibon, ΔαιβωΡ, ΔαιβωΝ.
 Josh. xv. 55, Cod. B., for מַעֲוֶן, Maon, ΜαωΡ, ΜαωΝ.
 Gen. xxv. 2, Cod. B., for מֵדָן, Medan, ΜαδαΑ, ΜαδαΝ.
 1 Chron. i. 32, Cod. B., for מֵדָן, Medan, ΜαδαΜ, ΜαδαΝ.
- Ξ** Gen. xxv. 2, Cod. B., for יִקְשָׁן, Jokshan, ΙεZαν, ΙεΞαν.
 Josh. xi. 1, for אֶחְשָׁפ, Aehshaph, ΑΖιφ, ΑΞιφ.
- O** Num. xxxiii. 24, for חֲרָדָה, Haradah, ΧαραδαΘ, ΧαραδαΟ.
 2 Sam. ii. 9, for הַאֲשּׁוּרִי, “the Ashurites,” Θασιρι, Οασιρι.
 Neh. iii. 9, for חֹר, Hur, Cουρ, Οουρ.
- OE** 1 Chron. iii. 18, Cod. A., for הוֹשָׁמָו, Hoshama, ΙωσαμΩ,
 ΗωσαμΟΕ.
- Π** Gen. xlv. 21, for מִפְּיִם, Muphim, ΜαΜφιμ, ΜαΠφιμ.
 Josh. xv. 52, Cod. B., for אֲרָב, Arab, ΑιρεΜ, ΑιρεΠ, or Αιρεμβ.
 Josh. xix. 33, Cod. B., for מִהֶלֶף, “from Heleph,” ΜοολαΜ,
 ΜοολαΠ.

- P** Josh. xi. 1, Cod. B., for שִׁמְרוֹן, Shimron, ΣυμΘων, ΣυμΡων.
 Gen. xxxvi. 43, Cod. B., for עִירָם, Iram, ΖαΦωιν, ΓαΡωμ.
 Num. xxxiv. 27, Cod. A., for אֶהֱיָהּ, Ahihud, ΑχιωB, ΑχιωP
 (mistaking ה for ר).
 Josh. xv. 58, Cod. B., for גִּדְדוֹר, Gedor, ΓεδδωN, ΓεδδωP.
C Gen. xlv. 17, Cod. B., for יִשׁוּי, Isui, ΙΕουΛ, ICουI.
 Num. i. 5, Cod. A., for שְׁדֵיאוֹר, Shedur, Εδιουρ, Cδιουρ.
 Neh. vii. 55, Cod. B., for בָּרְקוֹס, Barkos, ΒαρκονΕ, ΒαρκονC.
 Neh. iii. 10, for חַטְוִשׁ, Hattush, ΑττουΘ, ΑττουC.
 1 Chron. vi. 22, Cod. B., for עֲמַשַׁי, Amasai, ΑμαΘι, ΑμαCι.
T Exod. vi. 22, for זִיתְרִי, Zithri, ΣεΓρει, ΣεΤρει.
Y 1 Chron. i. 25, Cod. B., for רְעוּ, Reu, ΡαγαN, ΡαγαY.
Φ Gen. x. 26, Cod. B., for שֶׁלֶף, Sheleph, ΣαλεΘ, ΣαλεΦ.
 Exod. vi. 24, for אֲבִישָׁפ, Abiasaph, ΑβιασαP, ΑβιασαΦ.
 1 Chron. ii. 47, Cod. B., for שַׁאפ, Shaaph, ΣαγαΕ, ΣαγαΦ.
 1 Chron. iv. 12, Cod. B., for בֵּית רַפָּא, Beth-rapha, ΒαθραIαν,
 ΒαθραΦαν.

VI.—SUCCESSIVE CHANGES.

- Num. xxxii. 3, Cod. A., Αταρων for עֲטָרוֹן, probably first ΑταροΘ,
 then ΑταροΟ, Αταρω, Αταρων.
 Josh. x. 3, Cod. B., ΕΔαμ for הָדָם, probably first ΑιΔαμ, then ΑιΔαμ
 (Cod. A.), then ΕΔαμ.
 Josh. xiii. 12, Cod. A., ΝεCδραιμ for בְּאֶרֶץ, probably first εν Εδραιμ,
 then ΝεΕδραιμ, ΝεCδραιμ.
 Josh. xv. 4, Cod. B., Σελμωναν for עֲצֵמוֹנָה, probably first Ασεμωνα
 (Cod. A.), then ΣεΑμωνα, ΣεΛμωνα.
 Josh. xv. 31, Cod. B., ΣεΘεννακ for כְּנַסְנָה, probably first ΣενCenaX,
 then ΣενΘενναK, ΣεΘενναK (mistaking ה for ת),
 Josh. xv. 61, Cod. B., Αιχιζα for כְּנַסְנָה, probably first Cοχιχα (Cod.
 A.), then Εοχιζα, Αιχιζα.
 Josh. xv. 62, Cod. B., ΣαΔων for מֶלַח (salt), probably first αΔων,
 (Cod. A.), then ΑΔων, ΣαΔων with Σ from πολεις.
 1 Kings xvi. 18, αντρον for מֶלֶךְ, probably first Αρμων, then ΑΜρον,
 ΑΝΤρον.
 1 Chron. iv. 5, Cod. B., ΘοαΔα for מֶלֶךְ, probably first ΕοΔαα, then
 ΘοΔαα, ΘοαΔα.
 2 Peter ii. 15, Βοσορ for בְּעוֹר, probably first ΒΕωρ, then ΒΕCορ,
 ΒOCορ.

APPENDIX II.

2 PETER ii. 15.

In this verse we read "Balaam, the son of Bosor." Who is Bosor? The father of Balaam was Beor; why is he here called Bosor? The best Greek MSS. have *Βοσορ*; Cod. \aleph . *Βεωρσορ*; only two Greek MSS., one MS. of the Vulgate, and three ancient Versions, have *Βεωρ*, and are followed in this by Drs. Westcott and Hort, and by the Revised Version of the New Testament. This reading then is a Scriptural difficulty of long standing, and commentators have spent much ingenuity in accounting for it. Some of their theories seem certainly conclusive, and unobjectionable; yet there is a feeling behind each and all, as many as I have met hitherto, that somehow they do not satisfy. In briefly investigating these theories, I divide them into two kinds, which I shall call Word-theories and Letter-theories.

I.—The word-theories are those which suggest that the word Bosor does not stand for Beor, but for something else.

(1.) There is an old one by Grotius, which advocates that Bosor is a corruption of the name Pethor (Num. xxii. 5), Cod. B. *Φαθουρα*, Cod. A. *Βαθουρα*.

But such a corruption could only have been made either by transcribers or by the Apostle himself. If by the first, then it is difficult to see how they could have done it from either of the two readings given

above. If by the latter, then we must imagine, what is extremely unlikely, that it originated in some provincialism with which the Apostle spoke, and which he was in the habit of committing to writing also. Above all, the great difficulty is to suppose a substitution of the name of the place for that of the father. It is true that the words "the son," which are printed in Italics in the English Bible, are not found in the Greek. Yet it is held by the best Greek scholars that "Balaam, of Bosor" means "Balaam, the son of Bosor," and not "Balaam of the place of Bosor," which would be feminine in gender and not masculine. It is, in fact, like many similar expressions; for instance, Matt. x. 2, 3, "James of Zebedee," and "James of Alpheus," in both of which "of" signifies "the son of." This theory, therefore, is now generally relinquished by commentators.

(2.) Another theory is, that Balaam's father had two names. All we can say to this is that there is no trace of it in the Old Testament.

(3.) Another word-theory is that "Bosor" is the Hebrew word which means *flesh*, and that the Apostle is thereby making a mystical allusion either to Balaam's own besetting sin, or to the temptations which he cast before Israel, or to both. He uses, then, the Hebrew word *flesh* to signify carnal lusts.

But, in the first place, it has to be proved that this Hebrew word is used with this signification. Generally, when "flesh" in Hebrew has a spiritual

or mystical meaning, it is that of weakness and transitoriness. St. Peter himself quotes from the Old Testament, "All flesh is as grass" (1 Peter i. 24). But is it ever used to signify carnality, as the Greek *σαρξ* does? Even if it is, there is yet the difficulty to explain why, in this particular place, he brought in the Hebrew word rather than the Greek. (Compare 1 Peter ii. 11; iii. 18, 21; iv. 1, 2; 2 Peter ii. 10, 18.)

II.—The Letter-theories. These theories, whilst taking for granted that the Apostle meant "Beor," undertake to explain how he came to write "Bosor."

(1.) One of the oldest of these suppositions is that "Bosor" was a way of writing "Beor," on account of the *ṽ*, with which it is spelt in Hebrew. Some suggested that, according to a peculiarity of the Galilean dialect, which betrayed Peter on a memorable occasion (Matt. xxvi. 73), this letter was pronounced like *s*. Schleusner attributes it to the Greeks, saying, "*mutata litera ṽ in σ ex more Græcorum, non tam ad faciliorem pronunciationem, ut quidam opinati sunt.*"

But if this were so, whichever party you ascribe it to, we ought to have had also for Balaam Balasam, and for Gomorrha (v. 6) Somorrha. Both these names are found in this same chapter, and both are spelt with the *Ain* in Hebrew. No; this letter seems indeed to have had two sounds, corresponding to those of the *Ain* and *Ghain* in Arabic; but I fail to find a trace of its ever being pronounced like *s*, either

generally or in any province. Moreover, as I observed before, it is not likely that, whatever provincialism Peter manifested in conversation, he exhibited the same in writing also.

(2.) It is contended that, between Hebrew and Aramaic, the letters v and z often interchange; and, as the z has no equivalent among the Greek letters, it is by Hellenistic writers represented by ς . "Beor," therefore, was first, according to the Aramaic dialect, pronounced "Botsor," and then, according to Hellenistic usage, rendered in Greek "Bosor."

The objection to this theory is that, while all dictionaries agree in stating that the Hebrew z is changed into the Aramaic v , they do not support the assertion that the Hebrew v is changed into the Aramaic z .

(3.) One more theory I mention, and it is this. The Hebrew letters v and z look so much alike, that the Apostle mistook the one for the other; and, therefore, instead of Beor, he read Botsor, which, as I said before, could only be *Βοσσορ* in Greek.

But what does this imply? I believe that the Apostle, like Timothy, and like most Jewish children abroad in our days, had "from a child" known the Holy Scriptures. But this theory implies that he did not remember who Balaam's father was; and that, without any particular necessity to have the father's name, he opened the MS. roll of the Pentateuch to find it out; and then made a mistake in reading and copying.

III.—The solution I am proposing is not a new one. It is one that has already been suggested by numberless writers upon the subject. It is the first that is, I believe, in the mind of every Christian before he sees a Commentary; and is, undoubtedly, assumed by Westcott and Hort, and by the Revisers of the New Testament in their works. It is, that the Apostle did not write “Bosor,” but that he meant “Beor,” and wrote “Beor,” and that it suffered corruption in transcription. But if many have agreed upon this, I know not one who has ever explained, or tried to explain, how that corruption took place.

I propose, therefore, in the remainder of this paper, as far as I can, to supply this desideratum. First, we must ask what letters are required in Greek to represent “Beor,” so as to correspond to the Hebrew spelling of it. This leads us to several solutions, which may all be conceived to be possible, though none of them have, to my knowledge, ever been advanced by anyone before. The reply, that immediately suggests itself, is that the word must begin with *B*, must end with *ρ*, and must have two or three vowels in the middle, which, to a certain extent, may vary in kind. For even in the LXX. the name is in Cod. B. *Βεωρ*, and in Cod. A. *Βαιωρ*. The first of these is indeed the most apposite; the second is one of those several variations which are admissible without spoiling the name. It is possible, then, that the Apostle wrote *Βο*, and another vowel, which was changed into *σ*, and then *ορ*. We have now only to find out what

that middle vowel was that was changed into ς . An o is sometimes thus changed; for instance, Deut. xxi. 5, Cod. A., *ονοματι αυτων* for פִּיהֶם, which should be *στοματι αυτων*; also Ex. vi. 23, Cod. A., *Αβισουρ* for אֲבִיהוּ, Abihu. The reason is that one form of the ς , in the Uncial Alphabet, is very much like our capital C; so that an o only wants a small opening on the right hand side to look like their ς . But, as we cannot think that the Apostle would spell the name with three O 's, we find, upon further inquiry, that ϵ and ς are often interchanged. (See the List above). The reason of this is that the *Epsilon* was written like the *Sigma*, only with a little tongue in the middle, like the tongue of a bell. That little tongue could easily have been omitted by a transcriber, and the *Epsilon* became a *Sigma*. Therefore, one explanation might be that *Boσop* is a corruption of *Boεop*.

Another, not impossible solution, is that the Apostle wrote *BoΓop*, upon the *Ghain* principle upon which Gomorrha is written. It will then be easily seen that a little stroke, added at the bottom of the Γ , makes it like the square *Sigma* of the Uncial Alphabet; and turns the name into *Boσop*.

But, thirdly, I go further, and, as I intimated above, I say that the Apostle really spelt the name in the most orthodox way in which it is spelt in the LXX., and in Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, *Βεωρ*. But the change was effected in the following way. The *Omega* in the Uncial Alphabet is like two

circles joined together ; indeed, it was originally made up of two *O*'s. This *Omega* here was divided into two parts, one of which was a ready-made round *Sigma*, and the other an *O*. Thus *Βεωρ* became first *Βεσorp*. In a similar way the *ω* in *ως*, Deut. xxxii. 8, was divided into *ov* in Cod. A., and made *ovs*, which created nonsense in the passage ; whilst the *οε* in *Ιωσαμoe* (1 Chron. iii. 18, Cod. A.) and in *Zavoe* (Neh. iii. 13) were contracted into *ω*, *Ιωσαμω*, *Zavω*. Then, in *Βεσorp*, the *Epsilon* which, from what I said before, was always liable to different changes, in course of time easily became an *ο*, and completed the *Βοσorp*, which is now found in the great majority of MSS. with overwhelming authority. But another change took place in Cod. *Σ*. This reading *Βοσorp* was conflated with the original *Βεωρ*, and then corrupted into *Βεωopσorp*.

ERRATUM.

Page 37, line 11, *for* Ασυκρατος *read* Ασυκριτος.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PLACES.

(THOSE OF THE SPECIAL LISTS NOT INCLUDED.)

	PAGE		PAGE
Gen. i. 20, <i>αἶα</i> ..	40.	Num. iii., <i>xxvi.</i> ..	13
x. 2, <i>Ἰωαν</i> ..	32	x. 29, <i>Ραγουὲλ</i> ..	8, 34, 54
x. 6, 14, <i>Φουδ</i> ..	47	xi. 26, <i>Μωδαδ</i> ..	33
x. 7, <i>Ρεγχμα</i> ..	34, 5	xiii. 13; <i>xxi. 1</i> ..	35
x. 14, <i>Casluhim</i> ..	39	xix. 16 ..	29
x. 14, <i>Γαφθοριεμ</i> ..	48	xxi. 14, <i>Ζωωβ</i> ..	23
xii. 8, <i>Αγγαι</i> ..	35	,, 20, <i>Ναπην, Ιανην</i> ..	32
xiii. 10, <i>Ζογορα</i> ..	17	xxii. 5, <i>Pethor</i> ..	69
xiv. 1, <i>Χοδολλογομορ</i> ..	53	xxv. 14, <i>Ζαμβρι</i> ..	26
xiv. 2, <i>Βαλακ</i> ..	47	,, 15, <i>Χασβι</i> ..	43
xxi. 17; <i>xxiv. 49</i> ..	29	xxvi. 21, <i>Ιαμουν</i> ..	39
xxv. 2, <i>Ζομβραν</i> ..	26	,, 30, <i>Χελεγ</i> ..	47
xxv. 13, <i>Μασσαμ</i> ..	23	,, 38, <i>Ιαχιραν</i> ..	39
xxxii. 2, <i>Αρβοκ</i> ..	47	,, 44, <i>Jesui, Jesuites</i> ..	60
xxxvi. 14, <i>Ιεονς</i> ..	32	xxxix. 18, <i>Ροβοκ</i> ..	47
,, 41, <i>Φινες</i> ..	21	xxxiii. 24, <i>εκ Σαρσαφαρ</i> ..	60
,, 43 ..	35	xxxiv. 11, <i>Σεφαμαρ Βελα</i> ..	26
xxxviii. 5, <i>εν Χασβι</i> ..	43	Deut. i. 1, <i>HazerOTH, Dizahab</i> ..	11
xlvi. 9, <i>Φαλλος</i> ..	21	ii. 13, 14, <i>Ζαρετ</i> ..	47
,, 10, <i>Χανανιτις</i> ..	12, 16	xxi. 5, <i>ονοματι</i> ..	73
,, 11, <i>Γηρσων</i> ..	5	xxv. 5, <i>Συριαν απεβαλεν</i> ..	26
,, 13, <i>Ασσουμ</i> ..	25, 49	xxxii. 8, <i>ως</i> ..	74
,, 13, <i>Σαμβραν</i> ..	26	Josh. xi. 1, <i>Ιαβις</i> ..	21
Ex. vi. 4, <i>Χαναναιων</i> ..	18	xii. 5, <i>Λεβμνα</i> ..	24
,, 5, <i>Αωδ</i> ..	28	xiii. 16, <i>Βισωρ</i> ..	25
,, 15, <i>Φοινισση</i> ..	12	,, 18, <i>Βακεδμωθ</i> ..	22
,, 18, etc., <i>Αμβραμ</i> ..	26	,, 18, <i>Μαιφασδ</i> ..	47
,, 21, 22, <i>Zithri</i> ..	7, 45	,, 27, <i>Βαινθαναβρα</i> ..	27
,, 23, <i>Elisheba</i> ..	47	xv. 27, <i>Βαιθφαλαθ</i> ..	47
,, 23, <i>Αμιναδαμ</i> ..	25	,, 31, <i>Βεδεβена</i> ..	25
,, 23, <i>Αβισσουρ</i> ..	73	,, 39, <i>Μασχαθ</i> ..	25
Lev. xiv. 42, <i>στερους</i> ..	62	,, 56, <i>Ιεζδραελ</i> ..	43
xxii. 11, <i>εργον</i> ..	62	xv. 62, <i>En-gedi</i> ..	36
xxv. 27, <i>επι</i> ..	62	xvii. 2, <i>Σαλπααδ</i> ..	46
Num. i. 8, <i>Σωγαρ</i> ..	33	xix. 2, <i>Σαμαα</i> ..	25
i. 9, <i>Χαιλων</i> ..	33	,, 21, <i>Ηνγαννυμ</i> ..	37

	PAGE		PAGE
Josh. xix. 27, <i>Ενγαι</i> ..	37	Job ii. 11, <i>Βασιλευς</i> , etc. ..	19
„ 30, <i>Ρααν</i> ..	22	Psa. lx. 9, <i>Ιδουμαιας</i> ..	18
„ 34, <i>Αθθαβωρ</i> ..	48	lxxviii. 14, <i>Salmon</i> ..	45
„ 38, <i>Βαιθαμε</i> ..	48	lxxxiii. 6, <i>Ιδουμαιων</i> ..	18
xxi. 31, <i>Χελχατ</i> ..	47	eviii. 10, <i>Ιδουμαιας</i> ..	18
xxii. 1, <i>υιος, υιοι</i> ..	19	Prov. i. 1; xxv. 1, <i>Σαλωμωντος</i>	17
Judg. iv. 21, <i>Καδησειμ</i> ..	26	Isaiah xvi. 1, <i>μη πετρα</i> ..	26
xviii. 30, <i>Γηρσων</i> ..	5	Jer. xlv. 9, <i>Lydians</i> ..	14
2 Sam. iii. 5, <i>Αιγαλ</i> ..	61	xlvi. 34, <i>Ζογορ</i> ..	42
xv. 37; xvi. 16, <i>αρχι</i>		„ 34, <i>Νεβρειν</i> ..	27
<i>εταiros</i> ..	58	Ezek. xxvii. 23, <i>Χαρρα</i> ..	21
xx. 25, <i>Σουβα</i> ..	24	xxx. 5, <i>Lydia</i> ..	14
xxiii. 25, <i>Σαμα</i> ..	61	xlvi. 19, <i>Καδημ</i> ..	20
1 Kgs. vi. 1, 37, <i>Ζιφ</i> ..	50	Dan. xi. 2, <i>Περσιδι</i> ..	18
xxii. 8, 9, <i>Ιεμβλαα</i> ..	27	Matt. i. 3—12 ..	9
2 Kgs. xviii. 34, <i>Σεφαραναιμ</i> ,		i. 5, <i>Rachab</i> ..	41
<i>Αβα</i> ..	22	i. 9, <i>Achaz</i> ..	41
1 Chr. i. 47, 48, <i>Σεβλα</i> ..	27	x. 23, of ..	70
i. 55 ..	35	xxi. 9, <i>Ωσαννα</i> ..	42
ii. 42, <i>Χαλεμ</i> ..	25	xxvi. 36, <i>Gethsemane</i> ..	42
ii. 46, <i>Γεζουε</i> ..	23	„ 73 ..	71
ii. 55, <i>Θαργαθιμ</i> , <i>Σα-</i>		xxvii., 46, <i>σαβαχθανι</i> ..	42
<i>μαθιμ</i> ..	31	Mark v. 41, <i>ταλιθα</i> ..	45
iii. 12, <i>Ιωαθαν</i> ..	31	vii. 34, <i>Εφθαθα</i> ..	48
„ 18, <i>Ιωσαμω</i> ..	75	xi. 9, <i>Ωσαννα</i> ..	42
iv. 16, <i>Ζιβ</i> ..	49	xiv. 32, <i>Gethsemane</i> ..	42
„ 19, <i>Ιουδαια</i> ..	32	xv. 34, <i>σαβαχθανι</i> ..	42
vii. 1, <i>Jashub</i> ..	25, 48	Luke iii. 25, <i>Ναγγαι</i> ..	37, 51
viii. 3, <i>Αβιονδ</i> ..	28, 38	„ 33—37 ..	9
xxvi. 7, <i>Σαβαχια</i> , <i>Ισβα-</i>		„ 35, <i>Saruch</i> ..	9, 47, 50
<i>κωμ</i> ..	59	„ 35, <i>Ragau</i> ..	9, 34, 52
xxvi. 21, <i>Γηρσων</i> ..	5	„ 35, <i>Phalec</i> ..	9, 50
xxvii. 26, <i>Εσδρι</i> ..	43	John i. 40; iv. 24, <i>Μεσσίας</i> ..	40
„ 30, <i>Αβιας</i> ..	60	Acts i. 19, <i>Ακελδαμα</i> ..	40
„ 33, <i>Αρχι φιλος</i> ..	58	v. 1, <i>Σαπφειρη</i> ..	48
2 Chr. xi. 18, <i>Αβιγαιαν</i> ..	60	vii. 45, <i>Jesus</i> ..	8, 54
xviii. 7, 8, <i>Ιεμβλα</i> ..	27	xviii. 18, <i>Κεγχρεα</i> ..	37
xx. 2, <i>Εγγεδι</i> ..	36	Rom. ix. 29, <i>Sabaoth</i> ..	42
xxii. 8—10 ..	19	xvi. 1, <i>Κεγχρεα</i> ..	37
xxxv. 9, <i>Χωνενιας Βα-</i>		„ 5, etc. ..	14
<i>ναιας</i> ..	59	„ 7, <i>Junia</i> ..	15
Ezra ii. 46, <i>Σελαμι</i> ..	23	„ 14, <i>Ασυγκριτος</i> ..	37
viii. 2, <i>Γηρσων</i> ..	5	„ 14, <i>Hermas, Hermes</i>	15
„ 4, <i>Elehaenai</i> ..	38	„ 15, <i>Julia</i> ..	15
„ 15, etc., <i>Ενι, Αουε</i>	28	Phil. iv. 2, <i>Euodias, Syntyche</i>	15
x. 21, <i>Ιεηλ</i> ..	38	Col. iv. 15, <i>Nymphas</i> ..	15
„ 36, <i>Ονονανια</i> ..	61	Philem. 2, <i>Απφια</i> ..	48
Neh. iii. 13, <i>Ζανω</i> ..	75	Heb. iv. 8, <i>Jesus</i> ..	8, 54
xi 13, <i>Εσδριηλ</i> ..	43	Jas. v. 4, <i>Sabaoth</i> ..	42
xiii. 24, <i>Ιουδαιστι, Αζω-</i>		1 Pet. i. 24, etc., <i>flesh</i> ..	70
<i>τιστι</i> ..	16		

INDEX OF OTHER WORDS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Abram, Abraham ..	2, 39	Edem	4
Accents	31, 37	Edom	18
Αχιμαας	19	Εδραιν	17
Αγγαι, Αγγαιος ..	35	Ελαμ, Ελων ..	61
αγχιστευς	11	Ελιφας	43
Αγχους	35	Enoch	41
Ahab, Abiah	41	En-rogel	28
Αιγυπτος	11, 14	Εφραθι	18
Αιθιοπια	11, 12	Erasmus	50
Αμβακουμ	24	Εσδρας	43
Αννας	15	Esrom	9, 45
αντιστοιχα	44	Εσθηρ	45
Apelles	15	Ethnisation ..	11
Aristobulus	14	Evander, Evangelus ..	21
Αρταξερξες, Ασσουηρος ..	20	Eve	41
Ασηδωθ	43	Frankel, Dr. Z. ...	28, 62
Αθηναζει	44	Γαζα	20, 34, 35
Athur	11	Γεδων	5, 7
Αζωτης	44	Geneva	15
Balaam	31, 69, etc.	Gershon	4
Balac	50	Γεσεμ	4
Βαραχιου	17	Gesenius	24, 34
Bashan	11, 16	Γεθθαιοι	48
Βαθουηλ	45	Gomorrah	7, 34, 71
Beza	22, 36, 40	Grotius	69
Bosor	52, 69	Hexapla	32, 34, 39, 42, 46
Cadmus	42	Ηζρον	4, 9, 30
Chafur	41	Ηλι, Ησαν	39
Χαμ	40	Ητα	40
Χαρμηλος	14, 16	Ιακωβ, James ..	10, 13, 30, 31
Χερουβιμ	13	Ιαφεθ	45
Χετταιοι	48	Idiomatisation ..	12
Χσεν	43	Jehu	38
Cis, Core	50	Jelf, Dr.	48
Coverdale, Miles ..	37	Ιερεμιας	39
Cranmer	15	Jericho	39, 41
Δαβιδ	23	Ιεροβοαμ	39
Dagesh	45	Josephus, 13, 20, 26, 33, 39, 42, 46	
Demas	15	Ιωσηφ	46
Διασκευασται	57	Ιουδα	9, 15, 38, 52
Disamma	49	Ισαακ	7, 11, 31
Dionysius	42	Isaiah	38, 52
Δωηκ	47	Ισραηλ	31
Εβερ	9, 39	Juchobor	7

	PAGE		PAGE
Καδης	19	Peshito	7, 11, 22, 33, 35
Keri and Chethiv ..	23, 32	Pliny, Plutarch ..	42
Kikeroon	50	Priscianus	36
Κυρος	20	Red Sea, Rekem ..	11
Λαμβδα	28	Rev. Version, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 30,	37, 41, 51, 69, 72
Λαχis	19, 31	ρηχς	43
Λεβανος	20	Rubeel	11
Λεui	22	Σαβει	48
Lud, Lydia	14	Σαδδουκαιοι	42
Λυσανιον, Lysias ..	15	Salathiel	10, 46
Μαμβρη	26	Sam. Pentat.	25, 33
Martinus, G.	22	Sarah, Sarai	2, 20, 30
Mathneen	11	Σεκελεκ	47
Μαθαιος	48	Shechem	42, 45
Max Müller	44	Shem	9, 42, 45
Mekerchus, A.	22, 36, 50	Schleusner	71
Mercurius	15	Σηλωνι	18
Μηδος	14, 17	Σιδων	13
Μωαβιτις	16, 17	Σοκχωθ	31
Μωυσης	33, 52	Στεφανος, Στεφανος ..	15
Naasson	9, 45	Συρος	12, 42
Ναχωρ	9, 40	Thamar, Thara	9, 46
Naphthali	4, 8	Θαρσις	45
Ναπη	21	τερεβινθος	24
Νεβρειν, Νεβρωδ ..	27	Tsed	44
Noah	7, 9	τυραννος των	19
Obadiah	38	Tyndale	15
Οναυ	22	Urbane	14
Οζιας	28	Vulgate	33
Patronymics	13	Westcott and Hort ..	69, etc.
Perez	9, 30, 45	Zion	42, 45
Περσης	13		
Peisia, Περσιδι	18		

115



